A CHRISTIAN, SOBER & PLAIN EXERCITATION ON The two grand practical Controverſies of theſe Times; INFANT-BAPTISM, AND SINGING OF PSALMS.

Wherein all the Scriptures on both ſides are recited, opened and argued, with brevity and tenderneſs: and whatever hath been largely diſcuſſed by others, briefly contracted in a ſpecial method for the edification of the SAINTS.

By *Cuthbert Sidenham*, Teacher to a Church of Chriſt in *Newcaſtle* upon *Tine*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert White*, and are to be ſold by *Francis Tyton* at the *three Daggers* in *Fleet-ſtreet*, near the *Iuner-Temple-gate*. 1654.

CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY
PRESENTED BY
MRS WILSON
OF TUNBRIDGE WELLS
FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE LATE
JOSHUA WILSON Esq
1876

To his dear and honoured Brother, Mr. *William Durant*, my faithful Fellow-labourer in the Gospel; And the Church of Christ, over whom the Holy Ghost hath made us Joynt-overseers.

Dearly Beloved,

I *Present you these first-fruits of my poor labours, as a pledge of my love, and testimony of my unfeigned desires and longings after your settlement, and comfort together. I am indeared to you in the bowels of Christ, and for his sake ow my self unto you. My highest ambition in this world is, to see you stablished in truth, and flourishing in the glorious graces of the Gospel. I have treated on these two subjects, because I know they are the tempting errours of these Times, and have the faireſt glosses set on them, and have too much influence to disturb the Peace and Order of Churches: The first especially*

which eats out mens affections, and creeps at the heart like a gangrene insensibly; an opinion which hath been always ominous, and of a wonderful strange influence, accompanied with the most dangerous retinue of errours, since the first Embrio of it was brought forth; whether by a judgement of God, or from its natural and secret connexion with other principles of darkness, I will not determine; only God hath shewed some black characters on it in every Nation where it hath prevailed; though we cannot but say, many Saints are innocently under the power of it.

For the second, I hope when mens hearts come in Tune, their voyces will likewise: The former denies more Fundamental Principles, as the Covenant in its extent, and subjects; the freeness of Grace; the riches of its workings in the New Testament; and contracts the Gospel; leaving more Grace visible in the Legal and Old Testament dispensation, then in the New.

I have only summed up what others express more at large, with something new, and never yet touched, that I know of: And as to the method,

thod, all is new, and made fit for your uſe, if Chriſt ſet it home on you. I have nothing elſe to add, but to tell you, you have been yet kept pure in the midſt of many Diſtractions, and the violence of deſperate Opinions: Take heed of plauſible errours that come painted to you with the name of the moſt glorious truths: Loſe not your glory at laſt; try and weigh every tittle that is propounded: It's my deſire you may have the glorious Title given to you the Bereans *had, to be* (εὐγενέστεροι) *men of better breeding then to take up any thing on truſt, though from the Apoſtles themſelves, untill you know how they were inſpired: Compare Scripture with Scripture; do not diſtract your ſelves in the Goſpel; lay truths together, they will ſhine in their proper glory: Part not ſo eaſily with antient entail'd priviledges: Have ſo much pity to your Children, as not to blot their names out of Heaven by your own hands, until God do it by ſoveraignty; do not bury them alive: Thoſe that know the riches of ſuch a priviledge, will not eaſily part with it upon ſuch poor terms as moſt propoſe. I plead for poor Infants; and it's but charity to ſpeak for thoſe whoſe tongues are tied. I intend brevity in this, as in all the following Diſcourſe.*

The Lord fill you with wisdom and understanding, and give you to know what his perfect will is, and hearts to obey it: And thrive like Saints of the New Testament, that lie at Christs breasts night and day. *These are the desires of*

Your unworthy Teacher,

Cuthbert Sidenham.

CHAP.

Chap. I.

Several Conſiderations premiſed, as an entrance to the Diſcourſe.

BEFORE I enter on the main queſtions handled in this Diſcourſe, it will not be unneceſſary to premiſe ſomething in general concerning this Controverſie, which is ſuch a bone of contention among the Saints, for to make our way clear before us.

And 1. Let this be conſidered, that there is nothing in all the N.T. againſt the baptizing of Infants, not one hint from any expreſs word dropt from Chriſt or his Apoſtles; not one phraſe, which though never ſo much ſtrain'd, doth forbid ſuch an act: but there is much for it in divers Scriptures compared together; and what is wanting in the one, is ſupplyed in another abundantly, as hereafter will appear.

2. The ſum of all that our Oppoſites have to ſay, though they make a great deal of noiſe in the World, is only this, that they can find no ſyllabical precept, or word of command in terms, ſaying, Go baptize Infants; or any poſitive example where it is ſaid in ſo many words, Infants were baptized; only actual believers, as they believed, were baptized: all that they ſay beſides, is only to quarrel with our arguments, and make ſhift to evade the ſtrength of them, but this is their only argument, and their All; for however they talk of the Covenant, and fleſhly and ſpiritual ſeed, yet this is the *Goliahs* ſword, none like to it. I would therefore fairly encounter with it in the Portal, that I may ſee all their ſtrength before me.

Concerning which, take in theſe conſiderations: Firſt, this argument is built on this falſe principle, That no direct conſequences from Scripture are mandatory, and ſo obliging, nor of Divine Authority, which all Orthodox Profeſſors and Divines grant, but theſe which are againſt Infants baptiſm; and it is moſt clear: for,

1. The way to know Scriptures, is by comparing them together, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. and this muſt needs be by their Harmonie, and by deduction from one to another.

2. Without True conſequence were as Scripture, no one could ſpeak truth but theſe that ſpeak juſt the very expreſſions of Scripture.

3. There could be no ſpiritual reaſons nor arguments uſed in any Diſcourſe to be of any force or con-

conſequence, though from the Scripture; for there can be no arguing from Scripture, but by conſequences and deduction; for in all arguments there muſt be a medium and a concluſion, a propoſition and an inference.

4. Nothing upon this account can be Scripture but the very letters and ſyllables in the Bible; nothing of the meaning or ſenſe is Scripture; for you muſt draw out the ſenſe and meaning from the letters by rational conſequence, as the concluſion from a propoſition by a fit medium; and how abſurd would this prove, that letters ſhould be Scripture, and not the ſenſe? and ſo it muſt be according to that Maxim of theirs.

5. This is againſt all preaching, and expounding Scripture; nothing muſt be read but the very bare characters for to draw any deductions from; it is to no purpoſe, though never ſo direct and full; for if they be not Scripture, they cannot bind conſciences; and to what end is preaching, but to open and apply Scripture?

6. The ſearchings of the Scripture were the moſt uſeleſs undertaking that could be imagined; for what need I ſearch, but read? for no conſequence, by compariſon of Scripture, is of authority to ſatisfie my conſcience, if I draw a concluſion from a text, and perceive the meaning of it to be thus; if nothing without it be laid down in ſo many ſyllables, how many ſuch ſtrange abſurdities would follow the denying conſequences from Scripture, which are purely de-

deducted? and by this principle, that where there are not so many letters put together in one sentence, there is no command, men would soon draw Religion into a very narrow compass.

7. This would be as much against themselves; For,

First, They have no command in so many words, Go and baptize actual or visible believers: if they say such were baptized: it's answered, that is not to the purpose: for it's a verbal command required by them to give warrant to an ordinance.

Secondly, *That* they must prove by consequence also, believers were baptized, *Ergo* there was a command: Neither,

Thirdly, Can they prove one act concerning their own form of baptizing by any command, but by consequences: When they say Infants are not to be baptized, they draw it from consequence thus, because there is no command in their sense; When they affirm the Covenant is not made with believers now, and their seed, as with *Abraham*, it's drawn by consequence, because, say they, *Abraham* is no natural father to us, as to the Jews, and because that covenant was a mixt Covenant, &c. When they come to prove baptizing to be by plunging, they argue by consequence, because the word signifies it, because they went where much water was, and went down into the water, &c. though they are mistaken in all their consequences, as I shall hereafter shew; yet this is full *ad hominem*, and against themselves,

who deny consequences to warrant institutions, and yet have nothing for to prove their own way, but what is by consequence from Scripture.

8. It's common among the Apostles to argue in such a method, and to deduce one thing from another, to make out what they intended; 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. *We thus judge, if Christ died for all, then all are dead*; if the first be true, then the latter; so 1 *Cor.* 15. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. 19, 20. and all that Chapter, arguing out the resurrection by fit mediums: so about the Ordinance of Baptism, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, why these should not be baptized, who have received the holy Ghost as well as we?* There was never any command to baptize these that had received the holy Ghost, nor any example of any baptized on these terms; but the Apostle argues from the equivalency of the mercy, and the reason of the state they were in; the same method he uses 1 *Cor.* 10. 15, 16, 17, 18. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17, 18.

9. There will be hardly found a definition of the most doctrinal and high mysteries of the Gospel, but by comparing Scripture with Scripture, and so making it forth by consequence: what perfect definition of justification, or of justifying faith, in so many formal expressions in all the N. T. but what must be deducted by comparing Scriptures together to make one result? where are women either by such a wordy expression commanded to receive the Lords Supper? or any example? if they say (ἄνθρωπος) sig-

signifies both sexes, yet it's still by consequence, no command or example: and why not (ἅγιος) as fit to signifie Infant-Saints, as grown Saints, Infant-holiness, as perfect holiness? i'ts applyed to both if they will stick at a syllable, we may stick with them on the same grounds.

10. Deny consequences to have the strength of commands, and you will leave very few duties to be practis'd, or sins to be avoided, in the Old or New Testament: Expound the ten Commandments, the sum of the Law, without consequences, and very few shall be found literal transgressors, but most desperate debauched persons. *Mat.* 5. Christ expounds the whole Law, and by consequences from the inward meaning, draws out new considerations of duties; and since the Bible is but a short systeme of Religion, every place is fitted to expound each other; and this must be done by rational-spiritual comparisons and inferences; but enough to the first consideration on this head of commands and consequences.

2. Where we have a promise laid as the foundation of a duty, that is equivalent to any express command; for as commands in the Gospel do suppose promises, to encourage us to act them, and help us in them: so promises made to persons do include commands, especially when the duties commanded are annexed to the promises, as all New Testament Ordinances are, as well as Old.

3. We have as much in the N. T. to prove Infant-baptism, from the true principles of right to

Ordinances,

Ordinances, as they have for theſe whom they ba-
e, no ptize; for they baptize grown perſons on ſuch and
) a ſuch conſiderations: and we ſhall hereafter ſhew,
fant we baptize on as ſtrong and equivalent grounds; and
oth that's enough to warrant a command, to demonſtrate
them he ſame ſubſtantial grounds of the command to
teach the ſame caſe.

th of 4. If we can find no poſitive command in ſo many
to be words for their baptizing (ſhewing the ſame fun-
New damental grounds) it's requiſite they ſhould ſhew
s, the ſome expreſs command to the contrary, and ſome
y few uthentique repeal, ſeeing Infants ſo long enioyed
t de ch a like Ordinance: upon the ſame grounds
ound hriſt would not have taken away ſuch an antient
ne in viviledge, when his grace abounded, and ſuper-
of du bounded, but he would have left ſome characters of
ne of in the Goſpel, and entred ſome formal diſcharge
other his Word of ſuch perſons, and given a warning of
apari to the Gentile believers to expect it; but he hath
nſide oth by his words and carriages left clear demon-
ence rations, that he is ſo far from repealing, as he con-
foun rms it to Infants; let the Scriptures opened here-
xpre ter ſpeak to this.
o ſup The third conſideration premiſed is this, as all
d hel at they urge as to examples of actual believers, be-
nclud g baptized, all along the New Teſtament, eſpeci-
ande y the *Acts*, and that if thou believeſt thou mayſt,
amen t. we can freely grant without any damage to
is truth: For,
ve In 1. We ſay as they, profeſſing believers, grown
ght to men
nance

men were first baptized, and so they ought to be who are to be the first subjects of the administration of an Ordinance, persons able to give an account of their own faith; it was so with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 24. he was 99 years old when he was circumcised, and he must be first circumcised before he could convey a right to his seed; now you may as well argue *Abraham* was first circumcised when so old, therefore old persons are to be circumcised, and none else; as because grown persons were baptized, therefore not Infants, when they must be first baptized themselves; for Children are baptized by the promise first to them, and in them to their seed.

2. An affirmative position is not exclusive of subordinates; because believers were said to be baptized, *Ergo* not their seed, is not true reasoning; for their seed were comprehended with them in the same promise.

3 *A non dicto ad non factum, non valet consequentia*, as Divines say; because it's not expresst in so many words, therefore it was not done, is no argument especially when there is enough to shew it was done though not written; Christ speaks short, that we may search; he expects N.T. Saints to be so ingenious as to take more by a hint, then those of the O. who were not so bred as we now; they had every pin of the Tabernacle appointed; it's not so punctually set down now, either as to Churches, or Government, but only the main Substantials laid down, and it's left to the ingenuity of the Saints to draw forth the consequences.

La

Lastly, to premise no more; God hath always ordained some Ordinances; in the administration of which, for the most part, the subject hath been purely passive, to express his own free grace most eminently, as Circumcision on Infants; And can we think he hath left no Ordinance now as a visible character, only to hold forth his meer grace in the N.T. where he reigns by grace? And there is no sign so fit to express it as Baptism, and no subject so capable as poor Infants.

CHAP. II.

About the nature of the Covenant made with Abraham.

THE first great thing in this Controversie is, to consider the nature of the Covenant, which is the first foundation of the priviledge to believers and their seed, as it was first made with *Abraham* and his seed, in the name of all believers, and their seed both Jews and Gentiles; for so large is the extent of that Covenant to both, as hereafter shall be proved from New Testament expressions; and if we find the same Covenant reaching Gentile-believers, and their Children, as *Abraham* and his, we cannot be denied the new external sign and seal of the same Covenant;

Covenant; for though the outward ſigns may be changed, yet there is no change of the priviledges, if the Covenant remain entire. For the opening of which we ſhall conſider,

1. The naure of *Abrahams* Covenant.
2. How perſons may be ſaid to be in that Covenant.

For the firſt, we muſt begin with that place, *Gen.* 17. where God began not only to expreſs the Covenant in larger terms then formerly, but to add a viſible ſeal to it, *viz.* that of Circumciſion: There be many conjectures about this Covenant; thoſe that differ, conceive it to be a mixt Covenant, made up of ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings together, and not of the ſame purity with the Covenant in the New Teſtament, and ſo make a carnal part, and a ſpiritual part of it, and Circumciſion to be annexed eſpecially to the former, not ſo to the latter; this is the true relation of their judgement about this: Let us review the Covenant, and its terms, and we ſhall ſoon find the miſtake.

Firſt, and chiefly, We affirm this was a Covenant of pure grace, the ſame in ſubſtance with the Covenant adminiſtred now under the Goſpel, ſince Chriſts coming in the fleſh and ſpirit.

1. It was founded upon pure grace, Gods love to *Abraham*, and 'tis not any thing in *Abraham*, or his, to move God more then to the Gentiles.

2. It was a Covenant without works, therefore of pure grace, *Rom.* 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. and all along the Chapter.

3. It

3. It was a Covenant made only with a believer upon Gospel terms; the same the New Testament holds forth in the 3, 4, and 5. v. of that Chapter; now faith is the only condition of the Covenant of grace.

4. It was a Covenant made in Christ, and therefore a pure Covenant of Grace, as any can be in the Gospel, *Gal.*3. 16, 17, 18, and 29.

5. Consider the tenure of this Covenant, *Gen.*17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, to be a God to thee, and thy seed after thee.* Here is the substance and strength of this Covenant, to be a God to *Abraham* and to his seed; and what can be more then to be *Jehovah* to him? can there be any expression more high, or that can set forth more grace in purity then this? It's more then can be exprest, that God ingageth his Deity to him; and it is as much as if God had said, whatever I am in mine own Godhead, I will be to thee and thy seed, to make you happy and blessed: this is the first and main thing premised, and it comprehends Christ, grace, glory, all blessings above imagination; the Apostle in *Heb.*8. 10. useth the same expression as the sum of all, when he speaks of the new Covenant, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.* We need adde no more, if that were not a Covenant of pure grace, the Gospel knows none other.

That which they have to say why it's a mixt Covenant, and a temporal, as some of the most ignorant

affirm, is from the following expreſſion of *Gen.*17. 8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the Land of* Canaan, *for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, &c.* Now ſay they, if the promiſes be mixt, ſo is the Covenant.

To which I anſwer, that the Land of *Canaan*, and ſuch like promiſes, were but additional, and added *ex ſuperabundanti*, to the firſt promiſe, not at all incorporated to the bulk and body of the Covenant which was made in Chriſt, and conſiſted of more pure conſiderations; theſe promiſes were but fitted to the outward adminiſtration of the firſt promiſe of grace, and the ſtate of *Abrahams* family, but there was no mixture; For,

1. The Covenant with *Abraham* is repeated in the New Teſtament entire, without any of thoſe additions, as is proved formerly.

2. The promiſe of *Canaan* was typical of Heaven, and ſo did but more open the firſt promiſe, to be their God; ſhewing them that God would bring him and his to Heaven, and the fulneſs of his glory, as he would bring them to an outward *Canaan*; and this was ſuited to Gods deſign, in adminiſtring that vaſt promiſe by types and outward figures: ſo *Abraham* cloſed in with it by faith, as a promiſe expounding figuratively the ſubſtance of the Covenant, *Heb.*11. 8,9,10. ſo 13, 14, 15, 16. So that the firſt promiſe was poſitive, and ſhewed the nature of the Covenant; the other was typically expoſitory, *Canaan* ſetting out Heaven, and the eternity of their reſt with this God.

God in Covenant; and this will no more make a mixt Covenant, then the type and the substance when they meet together will differ in signification.

3. We may as well say, these promises in the New Testament make up a mixt Covenant, and so of a different nature, when God saith in *Mat.* 6. 33. *Seek first the Kingdom of God, and all things else shall be added*; and 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Godliness hath the promise of this life, and that which is to come*; which are as much mixt as ever the Covenant made with *Abraham* was; whereas all know, these are but accidental appendixes of the promise of grace, and dispensed according to the use he hath for, and the conditions of his Saints: thus *Canaan* was added to the Covenant, as all other things to the Kingdom of God.

4. If this be a mixt Covenant, because *Canaan* is added, and the like, then how comes it to be the same in the N. T. and to be of force now, when no notice is taken of *Canaan*, and the temporal promises? Sure in this mixture the promise of free grace was primary, and like oyl at top; for *Abrahams* Covenant the very same for substance, is clear, and without mixture in the Gospel, though it is administred externally, as it was then, and the blessings of *Abraham* come on the Gentiles, though not of an external *Canaan*.

If they say that *Canaan* was added only for the dispensation of the Covenant to the Jews, it's granted; but that it should make a mixture in the Covo-

nant, is most false, which is the same for ever, though the outward administration be different; things may be added, yet not mixt, as a mans cloaths to his body, and yet there is no mixture between a mans flesh and his cloaths.

But let us come to Circumcision, the seal of this Covenant: it sealed it, say they, as a mixt Covenant.

Then. 1. It sealed the one part as well as the other: take it in their own sense, that is, it sealed God to be their God, as *Canaan*; and so it was not a seal meerly to a temporal promise.

2. If the Covenant was so mixt in the nature of it, then Circumcision sealed unequally, though it was added to a mixt Covenant, for it sealed the promise of *Canaan* to those that never went into *Canaan*, as many that died before that time, and afterwards many that were circumcised died in the Wilderness, and under Gods wrath, and so sealed nothing at all, neither part of the Covenant visibly; and that is hard, that to so many there should be neither the fulfilling of spiritual, nor temporal part of the promise.

3. Grant them this Covenant was mixt, then it was either in the substance, or circumstances; if in the substance, then *Abrahams* Covenant was not Gospel, and believers must seek for another Father, as to the example of faith, and that were to make it rather like *Nebuchadnezzars* Image of Iron and Clay, then made up of Gospel materials; If in circumstances

cumſtances of adminiſtration, and additaments of external types, it's granted, and we have the ſame promiſe now, with new outward adminiſtrations; if this mixture were in the nature and ſubſtance of the Covenant, then is muſt remain as long as the Covenant laſted, and ſo unto this day; for no man is ſo bold (though many are bold enough) as to ſay that *Abrahams* Covenant is abrogated; if it be under any other conſideration, it's eaſily waved, and the truth the ſame: So that Circumciſion ſealed the Covenant primarily in its nature, as a Covenant of grace, and God being a God to circumciſe their hearts &c. and *Canaan*, and other things conſequently and accidentally, as God made a promiſe of them, for the better viſible adminiſtration of the Covenant to them in that external polity. And ſurely its beyond an ordinary reach to believe, that God ſhould make a Covenant with *Abraham*, and for his faith in it ſhould create him the Father of the faithful in all ages, and this Covenant ſhould be brought in the N. T. and renewed, and the tenure of it freſhly held forth to believers there, and yet at the firſt making of it God ſhould mix temporal promiſes with the ſpiritual ſubſtance of it, and annex a ſeal that ſhould only or ſpecially ſeal the temporal part of it, and ſo poorly confirm the main and eſſential nature of it, eſpecially when God ſpeaking of *Abrahams* faith, ſtiles Circumciſion the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of it. *Rom.* 4. But of this more in another Chapter.

CHAP. III.

The distinction of Abrahams *seed into fleshly and spiritual, into natural and believing, considered; whether the Infants of believers may not be called in the New Testament, the seed of* Abraham.

THE next thing which must have its place of consideration, is that question of *Abrahams* seed, with whom the promise was made; and upon this hinge hangs all the main weight on both sides; and if we make out Infants of believers in the N.T. to be in Covenant, as *Abrahams* seed, the controversie would be at end: To make out this, the most of the following Chapters are designed; only in this we shall fall more directly on the question it self.

Those that differ from us make many distinctions of a fleshly carnal seed of *Abraham*, and of a spiritual seed, a believing and a natural seed, which distinctions are taken out of *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 23. and *Chap.* 3. 16. and most true, if well applyed; but before I come to open the Scriptures, I would premise these considerations concerning *Abraham* and his seed.

1. That

1. That *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed were as much his fleſhly ſeed alſo, *Iſaac* as *Iſhmael*, except Proſelytes and Servants.

2. The Covenant was adminiſtred to all *Abrahams* natural and fleſhy Children, as if they had been ſpiritual, and before they knew what faith was, or could actually profeſs *Abrahams* faith.

3. It's no contradiction in different reſpects, to be a ſeed of the fleſh by natural generation, and a Child under the ſame promiſe made with the Parent; for they both agreed in *Abrahams* caſe; none was a Child of promiſe, but as he came of *Abrahams* fleſh: and as he came from *Abrahams* fleſh, ſo every one had the ſeal of Gods Covenant on his fleſh: Thus a ſpiritual promiſe was made with *Abraham* and his carnal ſeed.

4. There was no diſtinction of *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed and his ſpiritual ſeed, in the O.T. but all comprehended under the ſame Covenant, untill they degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, and proved themſelves to be meer carnal, and rejected the promiſe.

5. There is a carnal and ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*; even under the N. T. as our oppoſites muſt acknowledge, as well as Infants; ſo are the moſt viſible Profeſſors which they baptize; which may have no grace; and many prove carnal indeed, through the predominancy of their luſts and corruptions.

6. When there is mention of *Abrahams* carnal ſeed in oppoſition to ſpiritual ſeed, it cannot be

meant primarily or solely of those that descended from *Abrahams* flesh: for then *Isaac* and *Jacob* were the carnal seed, yea Christ himself, who as concerning the flesh came of *Abraham*; it must be therefore of those of *Abrahams* seed which degenerated, and slighted the Covenant of the Gospel, and these were properly the carnal seed.

Suitable to this is that distinction of *Abraham* being a natural and a spiritual Father: For,

First, He was a natural Father to these to whom he was a spiritual Father, as to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and the godly of their posterity.

Secondly, All to whom he was a natural Father were under the Covenant, and had the seal, untill they rejected themselves; the promise took in both relations, as to outward administration, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. And if men truly state things, you may argue as much against *Abrahams* natural seed from enjoying these privileges, as believers natural seed now; and with as much evidence of truth.

But let us weigh these Scriptures which are brought by our Opposites: First, consider that of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *They are not all* Israel *that are of* Israel; *neither because they are the seed of* Abraham *are they all Children, but in* Isaac *shall thy seed be called; that is, they which are the Children of the flesh, these are not the Children of God: but the Children of promise are accounted for the seed.*

The Apostle in this Chapter doth with a bleeding heart begin the sad story of the Jews rejection from being

being a Church, and ſpeaks as one loth to mention it, and therefore brings it in with a paſſionate and hearty Apology, v. 1, 2, 3. he was in heavineſs, he could wiſh himſelf ἀνάθεμα, accurſed from Chriſt, for his brethren, his Kinſmen according to the fleſh, that is, for theſe that we call Jews according to the fleſh.

Q. But what needed all this trouble to have a carnal generation of men cut off? why doth *Paul* take on ſo heavily?

Sol. In the 4, and 5, v. he tels you, *Who are Iſraelites, to whom pertains the adoption of glory, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the ſervice of God, and the promiſes, whoſe are the Fathers, of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came:* Here is a Catalogue of high priviledges which belonged to the Jews, which they were to be cut off from, which lay on *Pauls* heart, and was like to ſink him.

Ob. Well, might ſome ſay, v. 6. then the promiſe of God is in vain, if they be rejected unto whom the adoption and the promiſes belong.

Sol. The Apoſtle anticipates that Objection, Not as though the Word of God hath taken no effect; no, the promiſe is the ſame, and immutable; *but they are not all* Iſrael *which are of* Iſrael; neither becauſe they are the ſeed of *Abraham*, are they all Children, &c. This is the very natural coherence of theſe words; let us now uſe our judgements to diſtinguiſh and review the place, and we ſhall find it a weapon whoſe edge is turned againſt theſe that count it their own.

1. The

1. The Apostle is sadly troubled for his kinsmen after the flesh, for their rejection; his reason is, because of the Covenant, and the promises made to them, because they were the natural seed of *Abraham*: which holds forth that the promises and the priviledges of the Covenant were made indefinitely to all the Israelites.

2. That it's a most sad thing to be excluded from the outward and general administration of the Covenant. Why should *Paul* thus break out in his affections, for the loss of outward priviledges, if it were not such a mercy to be under them?

3. The Apostle holds forth, that persons may be under the outward administrations of the Covenant, and yet not get the efficacy of it; v. 6. *They are not all* Israel *that are of* Israel; the Covenant was made with *Abraham* and his seed, all that were of him: and yet all were not *Israel*, that is, partakers of the inward life and efficacy of the Covenant; the Apostle only in these verses endeavours to take off that Objection, that God had broke his Covenant by casting away the Jews, and so distinguisheth of these that were meerly of his flesh, who had the outward administration, but not the inward fruit, and these which were elect in the promise, in Isaac *shall thy seed be called*; the rest he cals the Children of the flesh, the former the Children of promise, v. 8. and so though they were under the outward dispensation of the Covenant, yet God was not mutable, nor his promise, though he rejected them, because of their

own

own degeneration; so that the sum of this place is,

1. That the Covenant was made in general with *Abrahams* seed, to all that came from him.

2. That in the administration of general and indefinite promises, there is a secret distinction, and a vein of election carried through the administration, that takes hold of some, not of others.

3. That none are the Children of promise, real Saints, but those that have the true effects of the Covenant in their hearts.

4. That all Children of Believers, though the promise visibly belong to them, as to *Abraham* and his seed, yet may not follow their Parents faith, and so not be *Israel*, though of *Israel*,

But here is nothing at all to demonstrate that Infants, because Children of the flesh, are not under the promise: but rather the contrary; for *in* Isaac *shall thy seed be called*, saith God: now he was a Child of *Abrahams* flesh, as well as these which were cast off, and yet a Child of promise; so God makes his Covenant indefinitely with believers and their seed, and yet the efficacy of the Covenant may reach but some, an *Isaac* or a *Iacob*, an elect vessel, and yet the other under the outward administration, until they manifest the contrary: But more of this from that, *Acts* 2. 38, 39.

I come now to that other place so much urged by them, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his seed were the promises made; he saith not, to seeds, as of many, but*

but of one, which is Christ : Now by Christ here cannot be meant barely Christ personal: for then no believer should be accounted for the seed but onely Christ; it must be meant of Christ mystically, or Politically considered, as the visible Head of the Church; if so Christ mystical, then to all the Elect as in him, and so to Infants as well as grown persons, who make up that mystical body; but o this the promise is conveyed under ground as it were, none knows the veins of it: thus in the Old Testament flesh and flesh came from *Abraham*, the Covenant administred to them both by its seal, yet one flesh enjoying the spiritual blessings, the other rejected.

Take the promise to be made to Christ, the seed, as the Head of a visible Church, then still it speaks for us; for Infants of believers were never cast out of the visible Church they were once in, and the promise is made now to them with their Parents, as shall be hereafter proved at large: but if we look no farther back then the 14. v. of this Chapter, we shall receive some light to this: It's said in the 13 v. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, &c. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Christ*: *Abrahams* blessing what was it, but the promises and the fruits, and priviledges of the promise and Covenant made to him and his seed? The same blessing is now come on the Gentiles, but through Christ, who took away all obstructions in the passage of the Covenant by his death: Now,

1. This

1. This bleſſing of *Abraham* was not perſonal, but to him and his ſeed.

2. This very bleſſing is come on Gentile believers, as on *Abraham*: therefore it muſt come on believers of the Gentiles, and their ſeed alſo: For,

3. It cannnot be called *Abrahams* bleſſing, except it come on the Gentiles according to the ſubſtantial terms of *Abrahams* Covenant: Now this was the abſolute form of *Abrahams* bleſſing, *I will be a God of thee and thy ſeed*; and this very bleſſing is come on the Gentiles through Chriſt, as it came on *Abraham*; and therefore it muſt be to believing Gentiles, and their ſeed: elſe it will neither be *Abrahams* bleſſing in the form, nor fatneſs of it; *Abrahams* bleſſing will deſcend on the Gentiles clipt half off, not like it ſelf: And it muſt needs be a very uncouth ſaying to all judicious ears, to ſay, that *Abrahams* bleſſing is come on the Gentiles by Chriſt, as it was on the Jews by *Abraham*, and exclude half the Subjects at once from any right to it; for ſo you muſt, if you caſt out the ſeed of Gentile believers.

And to what end ſhould the Apoſtle ſay, The bleſſing of *Abraham*, and not the promiſe or Covenant is come to the Gentiles, but that he intended it to the Gentile believers and their ſeed, as formerly it came to *Abraham* and his? This ſhall be further cleared from *Acts* 2. and *Rom.* 11. in their order.

But in *Gal* 3. 29. the Apoſtle (ſay they) deſcribes who are the ſeed; *If you be Chriſt's, then you are* Abrahams

Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to promise* : So that now no Children born of believing Parents can be the seed ; for they must be Christs, according to that in v. 26. *We are all the Children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.*

In general, not to omit that which *Beza* saith on the place, that *Claramontanus* Bible hath the words thus, and as he thinks more right, εἰ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ, *If you be one in Christ, then are ye* Abrahams *seed* : This is suitable to the former verse, where he saith, *There is neither Iew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, &c. but ye are all one in Christ Iesus ; and if ye be all one, then* Abrahams *seed* : From which,

1. It's clear the Apostle is endeavouring to take away all difference between Jew and Gentile, and to hold forth their unity in Christ, where there is no distinction as formerly : but now the Gentiles being one in Christ, are *Abrahams* seed, as well as the natural and believing Jews.

2. The Apostle here hath no intent to shew the distinction of *Abrahams* seed as the subject of the outward priviledges, and administrations of Ordinances, but to shew that none are spiritually and really *Abrahams* seed, and heirs of promise, but such as are Christ's, one in him with *Abraham* : For if this should be the distinction of seed as the subject of outward Ordinances, it would be as much against professing believers as Infants ; for there is a carnal profession as well as a fleshly generation, the former more abominable.

The

The Propoſition from this expreſſion, as they draw it, is thus; None but theſe who are Chriſt's are *Abrahams* ſeed, and none are Chriſts's but real believers, and therefore none but they muſt be baptized.

Thus ſome ſay (though weakly) The ſpiritual ſeed are now the ſubject of Baptiſm, the new Creature, the man in Chriſt, Baptiſm knows no fleſh, with many ſuch like expreſſions from this and other places: But let us weigh things.

1. If none but ſuch are *Abrahams* ſeed, and ſo none but ſuch the ſubject of Baptiſm, then viſible believers are not the ſubject of Baptiſm; for they may not be Chriſt's, or new Creatures, no more then Infants; hardly one among twenty that are truly in Chriſt among the moſt glorious of them, and ſo not *Abrahams* ſeed.

2. None muſt be baptized at all upon this account; for who knows who is Chriſts according to election and ſaving faith?

If they ſay, We have charitable grounds to believe ſo of viſible Profeſſors, until we ſee the contrary;

I anſwer, This is nothing to the Queſtion, as it is ſtated, nor as it lies in the text; the text ſaith, *If ye be Chriſt's, then ye are* Abrahams *ſeed*: You ſay none are in Chriſt but real believers, and you muſt baptize none but a ſpiritual ſeed, and new Creatures, which will require not only a judgement of charity, but infallibility to determine.

2. The

2. The Apostle is here describing what the real seed and spiritual seed are, as having an inward right to Christ, and not what the apparent seed of *Abrahams* was: For,

1. Mark whom he speaks unto; to grown persons, the *Galatians*, who were visible Professors and Believers.

2. He puts them to a trial of themselves, whether they were Christ's or no, after they had made a profession; for they having legaliz'd, and returned to look after Jewish Ordinances and works, he tells them, their Ordinances were nothing, their priviledges nothing, being Jew or Greek, but as they were in Christ: The same he follows on, Chap. 6. 15. *In Christ neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing, but a new Creature*: So that the Apostle here puts an [*If*] to the professing *Galatians*, *If ye be Christ's, then are ye* Abrahams *seed*.

3. If you have no more but the judgement of your charity to distinguish thus of men in Christ, real believers, and *Abrahams* seed, then we have the same ground of charity to act on Infants of believers: For,

1. They may be Christs as well as grown persons.

2. God would have us account them holy, as we shall prove from that, 1 Cor. 7. 14.

3. Seeing they have been taken into the same Covenant.

4. Seeing

4. Seeing Christ shewed so much respect to Infants, when brought to him. To judge a visible Professor to be Christ's, and *Abrahams* seed, I have nothing but the purblind eye of my probable judgement. To judge a believers Infant Christ's, I have a general Scripture assertion, and the ground of an indefinite promise, which is more then all my conjectures: So that,

1. Visible Professors are not the spiritual seed of *Abraham*; for they may not be Christ's; therefore there is no spiritual seed but these that have saving faith, which all have not.

2. Infants of believers are as much the spiritual seed of *Abraham* as visible professing believers, and we have as much ground to judge of the one as the other, until they manifest the contrary; and our judgement on them may have less deceit in it then there is in that we pass on grown persons.

3. If you will distinguish of *Abrahams* fleshly seed and spiritual under the Gospel, you cannot apply it to Infants, but to professing believers; for the Children of believers are not the fleshly seed of *Abraham*; but if there be any such distinction, it must be between visible grown Professors, of whom some are spiritual, and Christ's; and others carnal, and born under Mount *Sinai*, and not Christs.

4. It's a true rule in Logick, that in every good division, *Partes debent inter se opponi*, The Parts ought to be opposite: Now to be born from *Abraham* both as a natural and spiritual Father, was both

common, through the promiſe in the Old Teſtament, and not univerſally oppoſite; and ſo it may be now; an Infant is born of the fleſh of a believer, yet the Covenant makes the believer a ſpiritual Father in ſome reſpects, as well as a natural.

5. The ſeed takes its denomination from the Covenant, and its tenure; and if the Covenant be made to *Abraham* and his ſeed, and theſe were at firſt Infants of his body, and renewed with believers in the N.T. as we ſhall prove in the following Diſcourſe: then Infants of believers are the ſeed now as well as formerly, *Abraham* only being the firſt root and Father.

6. Viſibility of profeſſion doth no more make a man of the ſpiritual ſeed, and ſo Chriſt's now under the New Teſtament, then the Covenant in its outward adminiſtration in the Old, made all the Jews and their Children really new Creatures, and a ſpiritual ſeed; for under the one, and the other, perſons may be carnal.

All theſe conſiderations are to ſhew that theſe places of Scripture are miſtaken, and do not ſhew who is the ſeed as to Ordinances, but who are the ſeed as to election and ſalvation; and that Infants may be as well the ſeed, notwithſtanding all theſe places, as well as viſible Profeſſors.

Q. If any ſay, But we have no warrant to judge of any but by viſible profeſſion.

Sol. 1. Let us judge as God would have us, and we ſhall find as much ground to paſs ſuch a judgement on Infants

Infants as them; if God call them holy, we may do ſo, and it will be dangerous then to call them unclean.

2. The promiſe is the ſurer way of judging, ſeeing at beſt we can but judge externally, and with hopes; and it's better to rely on God, and to expect what he will do through his promiſe, at leaſt on ſome, then to truſt my own judgement.

3. The Word owns Infants of believers viſibly, as we own viſible Profeſſors, as the Scriptures following will demonſtrate.

For the preſent, ſeriouſly view all theſe places together, *Gen.* 17. 7. *Acts* 2. 38,39. *Deut.* 30.6.11, 12,13,14. *Rom.* 10. 1,6,7,8. with *Heb.* 8.10,11. *Ier.* 31. 22. *Eſay* 65.23. with many ſuch places, that hold forth the ſeed to Infants as well in the New Teſtament as in the Old.

I end this Chapter with this conſideration, that if you exclude Infants of believers to be *Abrahams* ſeed, upon this ground, becauſe they are not the ſpiritual ſeed: then daſh out the name as well of grown Profeſſors to be *Abrahams* ſeed, who are no more ſo really becauſe of that, then theſe Infants, and we ſhall quit the one with the other, and then there ſhall be found no viſible ſubjects of Baptiſm, either of Infants or grown perſons: for they are both, as to election and inward grace, unknown to us to be *Abrahams* ſeed; they were both formerly accounted *Abrahams* ſeed, grown perſons, *and Infants eſpecially by the Covenant*; and now the one is to be accounted

Abrahams ſeed, *viz.* grown perſons profeſſing; though they may have no right to the inward grace of the Covenant; and Infants who had firſt right next to *Abraham*, muſt be excluded, though they have never ſo real an intereſt, becauſe they are Infants, and cannot ſpeak for themſelves: But ſo much of this; the next Chapter will ſecond this.

CHAP. IV.

How any perſon may be ſaid to be in the Covenant; the divers conſiderations about it.

TO the former let this be added, becauſe it ſeems ſtrange how any can be in Covenant, and yet not partake of ſalvation: In opening of this, the common diſtinctions of all Divines muſt be repeated, that according as there is an internal and external adminiſtration of the Covenant, ſo there is a twofold being in the Covenant:

1. *Secundùm propoſitum electionis*, According to the purpoſe of election in Gods heart, and his eternal decree; ſo only the elect, and theſe which have ſaving faith, are in Covenant: this ſome call, and not improperly, to be intentionally in Covenant, God principally intending the Covenant to them; others call

call it ſpiritually and ſavingly from the effect.

2. There is a being in Covenant *in facie viſibilis Eccleſiæ*, In the face, or according to the judgement of a viſible Church, where judgement and charity are mixt together, *Rom.*9.4. *Deut.* 29. 10, 12, 13, 14. *Ioh.* 15. 2. *John* 1. 11. *Pſal.* 50. 5. with variety of Scripture: And of ſuch there are two ſorts.

1. Such as ſtand by their own viſible profeſsion, as all firſt Covenanters do, ſo all viſible Saints now, and ſo many Proſelytes in the Old Teſtament, *Exod.* 12.44, 45. *Deut.*29. 10, 11. *Gen.* 12. 5. Or elſe,

2. As in a Political Moral conſideration, as in the right of another through a free promiſe; as if a Prince give a title of honour, or a piece of land to one and his heirs, they are all intereſted in it, yet ſome prove fools, or traitors, and are afterwards incapable: It's ſo in this, and was with *Abraham* and his ſeed: Now that this diſtinction holds in the New Teſtament, I ſhall thus diſcover to you.

1. If men deny an external, as well as internal being in Covenant, none can adminiſter an external Ordinance, an outward ſign to any; for we muſt go by external rules in theſe actings.

2. Viſible Profeſſors will have the worſt of it; for we muſt adminiſter no Ordinance to theſe which are not internally in Covenant; and we have no proof but their own expreſsions, and our good hopes, and preſent probable judgement to warrant us, and many viſible miſcarriages to contradict our judgements and hopes at ſpecial times.

3. We ſet a ſeal to a blank to all grown perſons who are baptized, or receive the Lords Supper, without we know them certainly in the Covenant; and that who knows? for our judgement will no more hinder the ſeal from being a blank to grown Profeſſors then to Infants, without they prove real at laſt.

4. The beſt evidence you can have from any of their being in Covenant, is but viſible expreſsions, ſuppoſitions, and hopes, and probabilities, all which you muſt help out by your own charity, and fallible obſervation; for God hath promiſed no ſeal on my ſpirit for another mans condition; it's a bleſſed mercy if I get the ſeal on my own heart for my ſelf.

So that the great Queſtion will be anſwered from this, which Mr. *Tombes* and they all urge, That if God made the Covenant with believers, and their ſeed, they muſt all be ſaved, &c. With which I ſhall but thus parly.

1. Doth God make the Covenant of ſalvation with every viſible Profeſſor whom they baptize? or with every viſible Saint? or do they baptize them out of Covenant? Then how come any to fall off, and be damned? or what rule have they to baptize by?

2. Why ſhould it be thought more hainous to ſet a ſeal on Infants, as in the Covenant, then on theſe Profeſſors which afterwards prove not to be in Covenant?

3. Or

3. Or do they baptize, becauſe that perſons are in the Covenant? If not, then upon no ſpiritual account; if upon their being in Covenant, then either internally or externally; on the firſt it cannot be abſolutely, but as manifeſted externally; not upon a meer external being in Covenant; for then they may ſet a ſeal to a blank: if upon both together, the one externally demonſtrated by the other, then it is ſtill by the external being in Covenant that we judge with hopes of the other. There is a trick that ſome have got, whereby they think to evade this being in Covenant, as the fundamental ground of Baptiſm, by this diſtinction; That it is not being in Covenant, but being an actual Believer, gives right: *To which I anſwer.*

1. That the Covenant, take it ſpiritually, is the ground of faith, not faith of the Covenant.

2. If the Covenant be the ground of faith (for who can believe without a promiſe?) it may well be the ground of an outward priviledge.

3. To ſeparate the Covenant from the conveyance of actual priviledges, is almoſt as dangerous as to ſeparate actual faith from the Covenant; for the one gives a right as well as the other.

4. Infants in the Old Teſtament were thus as really to be eſteemed in the Covenant, as actual viſible Believers are now; and under the external adminiſtration of the Covenant, as the Proſelytes, who came in to the Jewiſh Church, and were the firſt fruits of the Gentiles.

For that there is an external administration of the Covenant of *Abraham*, or rather of God in Christ, even in the New Testament, is clear; for that many were baptized who proved hypocrites, and many believed visibly likewise, as *Simon Magus*, *Hymenæus*, *Alexander*, *Philetus*, *&c.* many in all the Churches; and yet these must be accounted the spiritual seed, though most wicked, because they can profess their own present sudden faith: and poor Infants of believers must be accounted the carnal seed, though so long under a Gospel promise; of which you shall not want proof hereafter.

Now that all which are baptized, or have any Ordinance, have it administred fundamentally on the ground of the Covenant externally administred, I prove thus.

1. God administers all his graces by Covenant, much more outward Ordinances.

2. Souls can have no challenge or interest in God, but by some Covenant or other; God is tied to none, but as he ties himself.

3. If there were not a visible and external administration of the Covenant, none should know of the invisible design of it unto any: all things would be in the dark to us, as to Gods Covenant, in a visible dispensation.

4. If this invisible design were not secretly carried on in an outward visible dispensation, there could be none condemned by an outward rule: for who can condemn these who are intentionally, and invisibly

in

in Covenant, or for *Re?* And if every one visibly in Covenant be intentionally and spiritually in Covenant, it's just the same.

The whole is this; None are in Covenant (say they) but real believers, the spiritual seed, so none to be baptized but such: when it comes to application of the Ordinance, then none are the spiritual seed but visible believers; and these visible believers can be judged by no way but by an external profession to be in Covenant; and Infants are no visible believers, therefore no spiritual seed; when as the one is as visible by promise, as the other by profession.

CHAP. V.

Opening that place in Acts 2. 39.

Ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν

THIS Text I first hold forth as fit to discover the New Testament application of the Covenant of grace, and its continuation to believers and their seed, as to *Abraham* and his in the Old Testament: Its the first Argument used after Christs ascension, to

to provoke the Jews to repent, and ſubmit to Goſpel ordinances; and the firſt open promulgation of the Covenant both to Jew and Gentile, with the prime priviledges of it; in which is contained the Goſpel-Covenant made with believers and their ſeed.

1. Here is (ἡ ἐπαγγελία) the promiſe; which can be no other then the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins, and ſo of ſalvation; ſutable to that in *Gen.* 17.7. and repeated at large in *Jer.* 31.34. For it muſt either be a promiſe of temporal things, or ſpiritual; of temporal things it cannot be; for there is no abſolute promiſe of theſe things in the New Teſtament, but as included in, or following ſpiritual mercies, as *Mat.* 6. 33. Neither is there a ſyllable in this Chapter preſſing men to look after temporal enjoyments, or engaging them to embrace the Goſpel by any outward emoluments.

Ob. The great and only interpretation of this promiſe by theſe that differ, is, that it hath reference to v. 16. and is meant of the promiſe of the holy Ghoſt propheſied of by *Joel*, *Chap.* 2. 28. which was to be poured forth in the latter daies, and now viſibly and eminently begun to be fulfilled at the day of Pentecoſt.

To which the Anſwer will be clear and fair, though that be granted; and not at all weaken, but ſtrengthen the former ſenſe: For,

1. That promiſe is a ſpiritual promiſe, and more large and comprehenſive of ſpiritual mercies then any

any other; the promiſing of the ſpirit is as much as to promiſe all at once, graces, gifts, yea Heaven it ſelf, for all are but the fruits of this promiſe; Chriſt in the Old Teſtament, and the Spirit in the New, contain all the promiſes in an eminency. When Jeſus Chriſt was to leave the World, and ſpeak all his heart at once, and leave his laſt bleſſing, that ſhould be better then his bodily preſence among them, he expreſſes all in this, that he would ſend the Spirit. *Joh.* 14. 16, 26. *Ch.* 15. 26. 16. 7. And of this large promiſe, as well according to Chriſt's promiſe before his Aſcenſion, as *Joels* Propheſie, the Apoſtles and Believers received the firſt fruits in this ſolemn day of Chriſts triumph: So that to ſay it's the promiſe of the Spirit, is as much as to ſay it's the promiſe of all ſpiritual things: For this read in *Gal.* 3. 14. the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the fruits of Chriſts death, ſaith, *It was that the bleſſing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through Ieſus Chriſt, that we might receive the promiſe of the Spirit through faith*; The ſame phraſe that is in this 38. *And in the promiſe of the ſpirit, which is to be received by faith, is included juſtification, ſanctification; yea all graces, and its here joyned with the bleſſing of* Abraham: But,

2. If they take the promiſe of the Spirit in a limited and reſtrictive ſenſe, for the external gifts, as the moſt do, for the gifts of tongues, and miracles, and propheſie, they both clip the promiſe, and make the argument and comfort from it invalid, and of no efficacy.

1. It's

1. It's a mighty wrong to that famous promiſe of the Spirit, to circumſcribe it in theſe accidental gifts which were eſpecially neceſſary, and almoſt only for that ſeaſon: when it's a promiſe that reacheth all the latter days, and is ſtill accompliſhing, though all theſe extraordinary gifts are ceaſed.

2. This ſtraitned ſenſe is expunged by the manner of the expreſſions of that Propheſie, both in *Ioel*, and this in the *Acts*, *I will pour out of my ſpirit on all fleſh, and on your ſervants and handmaids will I pour out of my ſpirit*: Which ſhews the univerſality and variety of the ſubjects, and bleſſings in this promiſe, that it ſhall be ſo large and full a mercy; as if there were to be no limitation of its meaſure.

3. If it were meant meerly of theſe gifts, why then there is no more benefit of that promiſe after the Apoſtles days, but that Chriſt was out of date, and did expire with that age: whereas it is a promiſe made for all the time of the New Teſtament, which is expreſt by the latter days, and the laſt days, up and down the Scripture.

A parallel promiſe to this you have in *Iſa.* 44. 3. *I will pour water on him that is thirſty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my ſpirit on thy ſeed, and my bleſſing on thy off-ſpring*: Now the promiſe of the ſpirit is always appropriated to the New Teſtament days.

And ſecondly, This cannot be the meaning of this phraſe, if we conſider to whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *to perſons pricked in their hearts, wounded for their*

their ſins in crucifying of Ieſus Chriſt, crying out, v. 37. *Men and Brethren, What ſhall we do to be ſaved?* Now what comfort could this be to tell them they ſhould have extraordinary gifts? their hearts were bleeding under ſin, their eye was on ſalvation, they ſaw no hopes of it, nor knew the way to obtain it; the Apoſtle bids them *repent and be baptized*; they might have ſaid, What ſhall we be the better? why (ſaith the Apoſtle) *You ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt*; *for the promiſe is unto you*: What promiſe? of gifts, of tongues and miracles: What is this to our ſouls? how will this ſave us? might they well object. It would be but a poor comfort to a wounded ſoul for to tell him of a promiſe of gifts, not of ſpiritual grace; and the holy Ghoſt is a better Phyſician then to apply ſuch a raw improper plaiſter to a wounded heart, which would hardly heal the skin: this promiſe is brought in as a cordial, to keep them from fainting, and to give them ſpirits to believe, and lay hold on Jeſus Chriſt: And truly no other promiſe but that of free grace, in order to ſalvation, can be imagined to give them comfort in that condition.

But to put all out of queſtion, That the promiſe propheſied of in *Joel*, and quoted here, was the promiſe of ſalvation, and the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, Conſult the Original in *Joel*, and the parallel in this of the *Acts*; in *Joel* 2. 27. the Prophet founds all the promiſes that went before, and all that come after, on this, *That he is the Lord their God,*

and

and none else; which was the very expreſs words in that Covenant made with *Abraham*: And then afterwards, *viz.* in the New Teſtament, to make out this fully, *He will pour out his ſpirit on all fleſh, &c.* v. 32. which is a part of that propheſie, and is quoted again in v. 21. *Whoſoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved*; one grace put for all; and ſalvation being put at the end of the promiſe, muſt needs be the aim of it. The ſame expreſſion you have again repeated, *Rom.* 10. 13.

And in the former v. 38. he exhorts them to repent, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *for the remiſſion of ſin*; th exhortation is to a Goſpel duty; the effect and profit of it was to be remiſſion of ſins, and receiving the gift of the holy Ghoſt; and the promiſe muſt needs be anſwerable, by which all is enforced; and it muſt needs have been a mighty low and diſproportionable way of perſwaſion, to put them upon ſuch high things in the former verſe, and to encourage them only by the narration of a promiſe of ſome temporary gifts in the following, when their eye and heart was ſet on remiſſion of ſins, and ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt; and nothing but a promiſe holding forth theſe mercies could have been conſiderable to them.

And it's very obſervable, in that verſe he joyns remiſſion of ſins with the gift of the holy Ghoſt; and then adds the promiſe to both, as the ground of one and the other, and comprehending both: And for that expreſſion of *Receiving the gift of the holy Ghoſt*,

Ghost, it may well be noted, that it is λήψεσθε τὴν δώρειαν τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου, *the free gift*; not τὰ χαρίσματα, *the gifts of the holy spirit*; noting the very sending of the spirit as a free gift to bestow all mercies on them; and so respecting rather the free and bounteous manner of bestowing the holy Ghost on them, then any limited effects of his reception.

By all which it is demonstrated, that this is no ordinary, common, no temporal promise, or of meer gifts, though never so extraordinary, but a promise of free grace.

I only add this to all the rest, as undeniable by the principles of these that differ; it's a promise made not only to these Jews, but it's universally to the Gentiles, and to all the called of God: but all that are called have not received such gifts of the holy Ghost which then were given; but every one that is effectually called doth receive the promise of remission of sins, and the free favour of God, and therefore this promise must be taken mainly in that sense.

But the great difficulty is in the following part of the verse, and about the interest of their Children in this promise; and therefore the next work must be to make out this, that the Children as well as the Parents are included in this promise, as they were in the promise made with *Abraham*.

1. Let us consider to whom the Apostle speaks: to the Jews, who were prickt in their hearts; *The promise is to you and your Children*; He speaks to them

them after the wonted manner of expreſſion in the Old Teſtament, when ever the promiſe is mentioned; and uſeth their own language in which they were trained up in from their Fathers; *I will be the God of thee and thy ſeed*, Gen. 17. *The promiſe is to you and your Children*; If the Apoſtle had intended to exclude their Children from the ſame priviledges they had formerly by the Covenant, he would never have ſpoken in ſuch a known dialect of the Old Teſtament: and to Jews, who could take it in no other ſenſe but this, that the promiſe ſhall run as formerly, to them and their ſeed.

2. Let us mind on what ground this is brought in, *viz.* as an argument and ſtrong inducement of them to repent and be baptized, as in the former verſe; *for the promiſe is to you and your ſeed*: He encourageth them from this to receive the Ordinance of Baptiſm themſelves, for the promiſe was ſtill the ſame to them and their Children; only now they muſt firſt believe and be baptized themſelves, ere their Children could be conſidered in the promiſe: If the Apoſtle had not intended to hold forth to them now believing and being baptized, and their Children, the ſame priviledges they had before as to the promiſe, it would have been the greateſt deluſion inſtead of an argument to perſwade them to be baptized on this ground, becauſe the promiſe was to them and their Children; they had been rather deceived by it then enlightned; and ſtumbled by ſuch a propoſition more then informed of a New Teſtament adminiſtration.

3. Upon

3. Upon what hinge can this Exhortation turn? where is the vertue and ſtrength it hath to move them to be baptized themſelves, but on this conſideration, that they ſhould not only enjoy bleſſings themſelves, through the promiſe, but their Children with them? The promiſe to them was enough for themſelves to ſubmit to that Ordinance: but the height of the enforcement is from the riches of the promiſe, that it was not only to them, but their Children; they might bleſs themſelves and theirs by ſubmitting to the Goſpel; elſe to put in the name of their Children ſpeaking to the Jews, was but to lay a temptation before them, and rather to puzzle them then encourage them: And doubtleſs the Holy Ghoſt would never in the firſt opening of the Goſpel, and encouraging ſouls to embrace it, uſe ſuch a language and expreſſion that might deceive thoſe he ſpake unto: for what could the Jews imagine or conceive upon ſuch a diſcovery, but that if they themſelves did repent and were baptized, the promiſe ſhould be the ſame in the N. T. to them and their Children, as it was formerly to *Abraham*, upon his believing and being circumciſed, to him and his ſeed? there being no expreſſion the Jews were ſo accuſtomed to, and more delighted in, then that of the promiſe to them and their Children: And but to mention their Children with the promiſe, if it was not meant to hold forth that they were ſtill in the promiſe, was ſufficient to have deceived them, who were never inſtructed in any other method:

The great deſign of the Apoſtle was to open the N.T. promiſe, and by that to encourage the poor wounded Jews to repent and be baptized : And that they might have no cloud on their apprehenſions, or diſcouragement, he utters it in *lingua vernacula*, in the phraſe the promiſe was always expreſt in the Old Teſtament.

4. If the intent of the Apoſtle were not to hold forth the ſameneſs and identity of the priviledge of the promiſe to the Jews and Gentiles now believing, as was formerly; he would never have mentioned Children when he mentions Baptiſm, and eſpecially not in the ſame line with the promiſe made to the Parents; and with one breath expreſs the promiſe to both, and make that the ſtrength of his argument to put them on the practice of that Ordinance : And doubtleſs it had not been ſo candid a way, nor ſutable to the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, to tell them of their Children, juſt when he tels them of being baptized themſelves; and name them immediatly with the promiſe, if the deſign was utterly to exclude them both from the promiſe and Baptiſm. I have been the longer inculcating theſe conſiderations, becauſe there is much in them, and engaged perſons can ſlightly paſs over the moſt eminent places with a meer glance.

Ob. But it's objected, That the latter clauſe, (ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται ὁ κύριος) *As many as the Lord ſhall call*, is a limitation of the verſe, and no more are under the promiſe; and ſo Children, if God ſhall call them, ſhall alſo enjoy the promiſe.

Sol.

Sol. For answer to this last objection, which is the strength of their confidence from this place, we must consider these particulars.

1. That in this verse you have an exact distribution of the world into Jew and Gentile, according to the usual distribution in other Scriptures; the Gentiles being usually called these *afar off*; and the promise equally distributed among; only he adds (*as many as the Lord shall call*) to these which are afar, as most proper in that place: but it can in no sense be referred to the former part of the verse, either to Parents or Children: For,

1. He changes the tense in both parts of the verse; in the first part unto the Jews, he speaks *de præsenti*, of the present application of the promise; *Repent you, and be baptized* —— *for the promise is to you and your Children*; even now the promise is offered to you; and they were then under the call of God: But when he speaks of the Gentiles, because they were yet afar off, and not at all called, he speaks *de futuro*, as many as God shall call, even of them also; which is the first express hint of the calling of the Gentiles in all the Acts of the Apostles.

2. How unequal would the distribution be of this verse, not suitable to the laws of expression among rational men? If *As many as the Lord shall call*, should be a limitation to the former part of the verse,

the word, *Children*, must needs be redundant and superfluous; for Jews and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Now Children must either be one part of the world, or comprehended under one or both names, or be a distinct world by themselves, neither Jews nor Gentiles: And this must needs follow on such a reading of the words; for the design of the Apostle is to hold forth the freeness of the promise to Jew and Gentile, and their Children; to these Jews at present, to the Gentiles and their Children when God should call the Parents, as he did these Jews. Now put Children by themselves, as a third party, and add *whom the Lord shall call*, and you exclude them from being either Jews or Gentiles, and so excommunicate them from any hopes of calling, or being saved: Now this is,

1. Contrary to that known rule in Logick, That *Omnis bona distributio debet esse bimembris*; only of two members, and these opposite one to another; to bring in a third mars all. So that it is most clear, the words must be understood as they are translated; The promise is to you Jews, and your Children at present, and to those afar off also, and their Children, when God shall *call them*, else *calling* can with no sense be applied to any tittle of the former part of the verse, without you make it monstrous, and unlike it self.

2. It's against another rule about distribution, which

which is, That *Partes diviſionis ambulent æquali paſſu*, That the parts of a diſtribution ſhould be equally ſet together. Now here will be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe; if the words ſhould be taken in their ſenſe, the Jews will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles, if Children be not equally added to both; the Jews had the promiſe made to them and their Children at preſent; theſe afar off ſhall only have the promiſe to themſelves, but not their Children.

3. Conſider how comes this word (*your Children*) to be kept in, for what end and uſe, if it were not to ſhew ſome ſpecial priviledge they have with their Parents, when God cals or converts the Parent? what ſtands it for but a ſtone of offence to conſcientious hearts?

Obiection.

All they anſwer to this, is, that the Apoſtle names their Children to comfort their Parents, becauſe they had wiſhed Chriſts blood on their Children, and ſo to give them hopes they might yet be ſaved, if God ſhould call them.

Solution.

To ſee the ſad ſhifts of errour, is wonderful: Can any man imagine, that the Parents could doubt more,

or so much of their Childrens being accepted and saved, when God should call them who were innocent, and only under the sudden rash curse of their Parents, when they saw that the promise was to themselves, and Christ offered pardon to themselves, who were the actual murtherers of the Lord Jesus.

2. Such a consideration would rather sadden them then refresh them, to mention the calling of their Children: For they might more doubt of that, then of any thing, whether God would call them or no, and be as far to seek as ever they were, that they would have but cold comfort upon this account; this was enough to break their hearts if that were in their eye, the old way of conveying the promise is cut off, no promise but to *called* ones; our poor Children are uncalled, and God knows whether ever they may be called of God: Thus might they reason: But when he includes them in the same promise with Parents, and exhorts the Parents to repent, upon this ground, that the promise is to them and their Children; this favours like a Gospel-comforting-exhortation, and could not be but of great efficacy upon their spirits.

4. What strange mysterious tautologies would be in this one verse? if that last sentence should refer to all the former *expressions*, we must read it thus to make out their sense,

The promise is to you Parents of the Jews, when God

God ſhall call you (and they were then under the call) and to your grown Children, when God ſhall call them; and to all which are afar off, when God ſhall call them: Can any man with his underſtanding about him think the Holy Ghoſt ſhould faulter ſo much in common expreſſion of his mind, when there was no need of adding or calling to any part, but to theſe that were afar off, who were never yet under Gods Goſpel call?

Laſtly, the word, Children, may and muſt be underſtood of Little Ones, Infants, not of adult and grown perſons, for theſe reaſons,

1. The word here (τεκνοῖς) properly ſignifies an off-ſpring, any thing brought forth, though it be but of a day, of a moment old: Thus when a woman is ſaid to be in pain, and to bring forth, this word is uſed, *John* 16. 21. *Luke*. 1. 31. *Mat.* 1. 26, *Luke* 1. 57.

2. It's an indefinite word, and therefore may not be reſtrained to grown Children, except God had expreſt it in a peculiar phraſe.

3. It muſt needs be eſpecially meant of Little Ones, becauſe they are diſtinguiſhed from themſelves, who were men of years. Now when we diſtinguiſh between Men and Children, we ſuppoſe the one adult, the other under age, and not grown up; and it is contrary to all ways of expreſſion to think otherwiſe.

4. It cannot be rationally conjectured otherwiſe, becauſe the Apoſtle doth joyn them with their Parents in the ſame promiſe, and not leave them to ſtand by themſelves, as grown perſons muſt.

So that all things weighed, this Text of Scripture, if there were no more, holds forth the ſameneſs of the promiſe to Believers of the Goſpel, both Jew and Gentile, and their Children, as ever it was to *Abraham*, and his natural ſeed.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Their great Plea from Mat. 3. 8, 9. *concerning* John *the Baptists Speech to the Phariſees and Sadduces, made vain, and that Text cleared from miſtakes.*

THAT we may ſtill take off the main Objections, let us view that place ſo much ſtood on, *Mat.* 3, 7, 8, 9. *When* Iohn *ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadduces come to his Baptiſm, he ſaith, O generation of Vipers, who hath forewarned you to flee from the wrath to come? bring forth fruits meet for repentance: And think not to ſay within your ſelves we have* Abraham *to our Father; for I ſay that God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up Children to* Abraham: From this Text they gather, that the pretence of being *Abrahams* Children could not give them a right to Baptiſm; and if *John* denied *Abrahams* natural ſeed on that account, much more would he the adopted Children.

That this is no ſuch ominous place againſt Infant-Baptiſm, Conſider,

1. Who they were he ſpeaks unto, the Phariſees and Sadduces, men at age, and degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, perſons that lived on their own works and righteouſneſs; therefore he cals them

γεννήματα

γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, *A generation of Vipers*; which was not as they were *Abrahams* Children, but as they had not walked in *Abrahams* ſteps, but were quite degenerated: Thus he did not refuſe them becauſe *Abraham* was their Father, or upon that account that *Abrahams* ſeed had not right to the promiſe; but as only pretending *Abraham* to be their Father, when they walkt contrary to the principles of *Abrahams* faith.

2. This is the ſame now as to grown viſible Profeſſors, who have related their faith to the Church, and ſo are baptized upon that account of faith, and repentance: yet if afterwards they grow carnal and apoſtate, and if ſuch ſhould come to receive the Lords Supper, and challenge it becauſe they are baptized, we might ſay the ſame as *Iohn* to the Phariſees and Sadducees: Do not think to ſay that you are baptized, or that you have had godly Parents; for you are a generation of Vipers, you have cut off your own right by contrary actings in your own perſons; and yet it doth nothing at all impeach the truth of this poſition, That Believers and their Infants are in Covenant, and ought to be judged ſo until they manifeſt the contrary; or that if they believed themſelves afterwards, the promiſe ſhould not be unto them and their Children: And that Text holds not no more then this, That when perſons are grown up to years, and come to underſtanding, they muſt then ſtand on their right, and look to make out perſonal qualifications for new Ordinances.

3. This

3. This was at the first institution of the Ordinance, when Baptism was newly administred: Now new institutions (as before) require grown persons, and actual visible believers to be the first subject of them; they could not baptize their Children first; for then the Parents would be neglected; and the bringing in of a new Ordinance requires renewing of special acts in these which partake first of it; as if an old Lease which is made in the name of a man and his Children, be at such a season to be renewed upon some certain terms, the man himself must come, and acknowledge his owning these terms, and then it is to him and his, as before: So now in the New Testament God renews the Covenant of *Abraham*, adds a new initiating seal to it; it was before entail'd in such a line, which is cut off; it's now of the same nature, only every one must come in his own person first, as *Abraham*, and enter his own name, and then the promise is to him and his seed: Thus it was in the former place, where when the Jews came to be baptized, they were exhorted first to repent and be baptized themselves; then the *promise is to you and your Children*: So that this we affirm,

1. That no man must be baptized, or receive an Ordinance by any fleshly prerogative; but where there is an entail of a promise, there is a spiritual ground of administration.

2. That no person grown up to years of understanding, hath right to a sealing Ordinance, but upon his own personal qualifications.

3. That

3. That persons may have present capacities, and visible right to Ordinances, and yet afterwards cut off themselves, and be found incapable, as *Ishmael*: and here the Pharisees and Sadduces.

4. That the exception of some persons upon the account of their degeneration, and personal defects, doth not hinder but the old priviledges of the promise may be conveyed to these which do really embrace the Gospel, and to their seed; all these are undeniable in themselves: And this Text reacheth no further then to the exclusion of these which had demonstrated themselves to be only the Children of the flesh, and not of the promise also: which is a demonstration only *à posteriori*, from their after actings; and teacheth us that these that boast in outward priviledges, without looking after personal qualifications, and holy frames within, may be as well judged carnal, as Heathens and prophane persons.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

That ſpecial place in 1 Cor. 7. 14. *opened, and argued;* Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.

THIS place of Scripture, though it ſeems to ſtand by it ſelf, yet hath full correſpondence and harmony with all other places in the N. T. concerning this truth. As the former did hold forth the promiſe, the Covenant to Believers and their Children, in diſtinction from all the world: ſo doth this leave a character of ſpecial qualifications ſurable to a ſubject of ſuch an Ordinance; and when the promiſe and the qualification ſhall meet together, there is enough for to capacitate to any Ordinance.

The Apoſtle is in this verſe anſwering a ſcruple which might ariſe in the hearts of the *Corinthians* concerning abiding together of married perſons; the one being a Convert, and a Believer; the other, whether man or woman, an Unbeliever; as it was a common caſe in the Apoſtles times, the Husband might be converted, the Wife not; and the Wife converted, and not the Husband; the Word working on the one, not on the other; this begat a doubt in the believing Party, whether he or ſhe might with a good conſcience live together in that ſtate.

The

The Apostle answers it, ver. 12, 13. positively, That they ought not to separate, or leave each other, notwthistanding that the one was an Unbeliever: And he gives in this ver. 14. a strong and peculiar argument, which he makes *instar omnium*; for the unbelieving Husband is sanctified in the believing Wife, &c. *Else were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*

The scope of the Apostle here is to hold forth some special Gospel-priviledge annexed to the *state*: and he frames his argument by no ordinary medium, of the lawfulness of the marriage according to a natural, moral or positive rule, but *à majori*, from an eminent advantage they had together in the Gospel: For,

1. The unbelieving Husband is sanctified in, or, to, or by the Wife.

2. The Children in such a state are holy, as if they had been both believers.

That the Apostle holds out a Gospel-priviledge, not common to meer unbelievers in their marriage-state, is clear;

1. Because the Apostle puts the advantage on the believers side, and there fixeth it; the unbelieving Husband is sanctified in the Wife, as believing; and so contrarily, the unbelieving Wife in the Husband: So *Beza* affirms, that in two special Copies he finds the words thus read, ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ πιστῇ, ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ πιστῷ: neither can it hold sense with the former words but as thus read: And if it had not been

been the Apoſtles proper meaning to ſhew the ſpecial priviledge the believing party hath notwithſtanding the unbeliever, he would have only ſaid, the Husband is ſanctified to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband; that would have been the plaineſt and leaſt ambiguous expreſſion of ſuch a ſentence: and the Apoſte would never have made an argument of four terms, when three could only ſatisfie; for all know, that an argument with four terms is moſt deceitful and falſe.

2. The Apoſtle doth uſe higher terms and phraſes in this argument, then is ever uſed in Scripture to expreſs a meer lawful or common priviledge; as to be ſanctified in the Wife, and the Children to be holy; expreſſions of another dialect then to hold forth a civil, or natural, or legal conjunction; being ſingled out in Scripture, to hold forth the beſt ſtate of perſons and things, in relation to God and his uſe.

And the Apoſtle uſeth two terms, both negative and affirmative; *they are not unclean, but holy*; the opening of the uſe of which two words will clear the point under conſideration.

The word here (ἀκάθαρτα) *unclean*, in the Old Teſtament, is commonly uſed for thoſe legal polluti-ons and uncleanneſſes which made men to be ſeparated from the Congregation, and excommunicated from the priviledge of Ordinances, until they were waſhed and ſanctified; Thus in *Levit.* 5. 2, 3, 4. *Chap.* 7. 19. & 14. 7, 8. *Iſa.* 52. 1. *Hag.* 2. 13. with many other places, where *unclean* is oppoſed to a

pre-

present suitable capacity for Church-priviledges; But that famous place in *Acts.* 10. 14. shews it most clear what the proper use of this word is; he joyns it there with what is common or prophane: When the vision came to him of eating all sorts of Creatures, he saith, *Not so Lord; for I have not eaten any thing that is common or unclean* (κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον). This vision was about his going to *Cornelius* to open the Gospel to him, and bring him into the Church who was a Gentile, and so common and unclean, not fit for Gospel-priviledges, as the Iews were thought to be. Now in a civil sense things that are common are not unclean; but in a religious sense, what is common is adjudged unclean; Now *Cornelius* being a Gentile, without the pale of the Iewish Church, he cals him common and unclean, as all the Gentiles were before they came under the promise: but God answered, *What God hath clensed*, or sanctified, *call not thou common: Cornelius* was not a Bastard, nor unlawfully begotten; but he was not accounted a fit member, he was without the Church; therefore the Apostle cals him common and unclean: Iust in the same phrase with the Apostle here, when he saith that Children are not unclean, he must needs mean they are not of common use, or to be excluded from outward priviledges of the Church: But that is not all, but he positively saith they are (*holy*) ἅγια; not only ἀκάθαρτα, *not unclean*: And this latter word is most used to express the Hebrew word טָמֵא, which ever signifies what is *usui Divino accommodatum*, that which

which is appropriated to a Divine use; which is the proper notion of holiness in the Old and New Testament, and never taken otherwise: For the proof of which, I have compared above three hundred places in the Old Testament according to the Septuagint; and all the N. T. places where the word is used. And this all do grant, even Mr. *Tombes* himself, that the word generally is taken in Scripture to express a separation of things to God, and he only brings these places wherein he thinks there is another use of it. 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. *Every Creature of God is good, and not to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the Word and Prayer* (ἁγιάζεται) *Hence*, saith he, *is meant only the lawful use of the Creature, in opposition to what is to be refused.* It is a wonder, but that God leaves men to blindness when they leave truth, how any man of common understanding, finding the Word *holy* & *sanctified*, always used in a religious sense, should fly to this place to make an exception. The Apostle saith first, *Every Creature which God hath made is good in it self, and none to be refused*: that is, all may be lawfully used without any legal pollution, as formerly: But then he goes higher, speaking of a religious use of outward things; *They are sanctified by the Word and Prayer; they are all good, and lawful in their use to every man: but they are only sanctified by these holy means, the Word and Prayer.* And he might have as well said, that the Word and Prayer are not holy means, but only lawful to be used; as that the sanctification which is by

the Word and Prayer, is to make the Creatures only lawful to be uſed. If a wicked man eat his meat without ſeeking a bleſſing on it, or giving thanks, will any one ſay that he hath not a lawful uſe of the Creature? but any man may ſay, it's not ſanctified to him. The Apoſtle in theſe 2. ver. goes on *gradatim*, by degrees, from a lawful uſe to a holy uſe of the Creatures; *All is good, and may be uſed, but they are ſanctified by the Word and Prayer:* thus you ſee the nature of this priviledged place.

But the main place Mr. *Tombes* alledgeth for holineſs to be uſed for what is barely civil, or lawful, is that 1 *Theſ.* 4.3,4,7. *This is the will of God, your ſanctification, that you abſtain from fornication, and let every one poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honor; for God hath not called us to uncleanneſs, but holineſs. Here uncleanneſs is taken,* ſaith he, *for fornication, and holineſs for chaſtity.*

To which I anſwer with Mr. *Marſhal*, That chaſtity among the Heathens is never called ſanctification, but among Believers it is, being a part of the new Creation, and one branch and part of their ſanctification wrought by the Spirit of God. And though Mr. *Tombes* ſaith this is but a ſhift, yet he ſhall ſee it demonſtrative, if he obſerve the phraſes in the Text, and the nature of ſanctification; in the 1, & 2. ver. the Apoſtle beſeecheth and exhorteth them *to walk as they had received from him how to walk, and to pleaſe God according to the rules of Jeſus Chriſt*; and he urgeth it in ver. the 3. with this;

It's the Will of God, even your ſanctification, that is, that you ſhould walk in all holineſs, ſutable to the bleſſed rules of the Goſpel, and as one part and expreſſion of holineſs, to abſtain from ſin: And he inſtanceth ſpecially in fornication, which was the common and reigning ſin among the Gentiles: So that if you view the place you ſhall find, That,

1. He ſpeaks of ſanctification in general, in its full latitude, ver. 3. as ſutable to all the will and mind of God; *This is the Will of God, even your ſanctification*; that is, it is Gods command, and Gods delight to ſee you ſanctified: then he brings in abſtinence from fornication (the ſin of the times) as one part of that holineſs God requires: For ſanctification may be conſidered as it lies in vivification, or in mortification, which for diſtinctions ſake we may call the two parts of ſanctification. Now chaſtity in it ſelf, as in the Heathens and natural men, is not properly a part of ſanctification; ſome other Epithite becomes it better: Would Mr. *Tombs* call all the abſtinencies and actings of the Heathens by the name of ſanctifications, and ſpeak like a Chriſtian and a Divine? Would it be proper to ſay in his Pulpit (when he was ſpeaking of the nature of holineſs and chaſtity) ſanctified *Socrates*, holy *Ariſtides*? And can he think the Apoſtle would expreſs that which is common among Heathens, in ſuch a high Goſpel-dialect as ſanctification is appropriated alwayes in Scripture to God, Angels, Saints, and their higheſt graces and workings, and to things raiſed above common uſe, de-

dicated to God and his ſervice, but that he meant it according as the whole tenure of Scripture defines holineſs? How much will the phraſe of holineſs and ſanctification be debaſed and made common, if that ſenſe ſhould be admitted, contrary to the Scripture uſe of the Word? But that is a weak caſe that puts men to ſuch extraordinary ſhifts to maintain.

But to go on a little further; The ſame word is uſed by the Apoſtle in all his ſalutations, and inſcriptions of his Epiſtles to all the Churches; τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints* or holy ones at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Epheſus*, *&c.* which when appropriated to perſons, always ſignifies a viſible Saint: So here, when he calls Children of believing Parents holy, he cannot but mean they are to be accounted as viſible Saints, until they do profeſs the contrary; and I know no reaſon can be given why the meaning of the Apoſtle in his Epiſtles, when he writes τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints*, ſhould not be as well underſtood written only to the legitimate, and thoſe that are not baſtards at *Rome*, *Corinth*, *&c.* as well as for them to interpret the ſame word ſo in this place: For ἅγιοι, when applied to grown men, muſt ſignifie viſible and Evangelical holineſs, and muſt be tranſlated Saints: but when applied to Children, it muſt only ſignifie legitimacy, that they are not Baſtards; when all men know, that *magis & minus non variant ſpeciem*; and the word is of the ſame import in every place of the New Teſtament.

Ob. If any ſhall be ſo critical as Mr. *Tombes* is,

to

to enquire how they can be ſaid to be holy: what holineſs is here meant, whether inherent, or imputative, or viſible?

Sol. I anſwer, It's a holineſs of ſpecial ſeparation to God, and his uſe, as a peculiar people: Some call it a federal holineſs, from the ground of the priviledge; others an Eccleſiaſtical, or Church holineſs, from the account and eſteem the Church ought to have of ſuch Children: but the firſt more fully anſwers the largeſt uſe of the word in Scripture. As for Infants,

1. They are capable of inherent holineſs.

2. They are in Covenant, as we have proved, and ſo have a holy relation on them.

3. They are capable of ſeparation to Gods uſe from the womb, and ſo of being holy to God.

4. By the ſame reaſon we account grown men holy, we may account Infants of believers holy; for theſe that make a profeſſion, may have no inward and inherent holineſs; and a bare profeſſion is not holineſs; we only account them holy by a judicious charity; and we are often deceived, and have cauſe to repent of our judgements: Infants may be inwardly ſanctified, and God hath taken them into the Covenant with their Parents, and would have us look on them as ſeparated to himſelf; which is ground enough to build our charity on, as to eſteem them holy, as grown perſons. There is no difference but this in it; That concerning the holineſs of perſons at age, we truſt our own judgements; and in judging

of Infants we truſt Gods Word, who hath comprehended them under the promiſe with their Parents; there hath been as many deceits in the event, in our judgement of thoſe of riper years, a in that which is acted through a mixture of faith and charity on Infants. And Gods promiſe, though never ſo indefinite, is a ſurer ground for hope, then my probable judgement; which is the moſt I can have of the generality of Profeſſors of riper years.

Q. But if any one ſay further, What is this to Baptiſm? here is no mention of it in this place.

Sol. It's true, baptiſm is not mentioned here; but here is mention of a qualified ſubject for Baptiſm, which is all that is contended for: And if the Apoſtle had ſaid they were believers, then theſe of the contrary opinion would conclude, here is enough for Baptiſm; but its all one, in that he calls them holy, which you ſee is more then legitimate; and you may tranſlate it with as much propriety, *Elſe were your Children impure, but now they are Saints*; that is, ſo to be eſteemed through Gods Covenant, as if they had profeſſed their own faith.

Laſtly, As it would be moſt abſurd to imagine the Apoſtle ſhould uſe a pure religious word to expreſs a common and ordinary priviledge: ſo there would be no conſiderable medium for augmentation in that ſenſe, and no ſuch force in ἐπεὶ ἄρα (*elſe were, &c.*) which hath force from the ſpecialneſs of the priviledge to their iſſue, not only to be lawfully begotten, as the Children of unbelievers are, when lawfully

lawfully married: but to be in a peculiar ſtate of ſeparation to God, and to be accounted fit members with the believing Parent of the viſible Church of Chriſt.

And what a poor and cold anſwer, as to comfort, would it be, when the believer was ſcrupled about abiding with his or her unbelieving yoke-fellow, to tell them, Continue together; for your Children ſhall not be Baſtards: but how full of ſtrength and ſweetneſs muſt it be, if taken in the contrary ſenſe? Remain with your yoke-fellows, though unbelievers; they are ſanctified to you, and you ſhall notwithſtanding bring forth a holy ſeed; a ſeed of God, as the Old Teſtament expreſſion; in Covenant, as if you were both believers: this ſounds like a medium moſt demonſtrative and conſolatory, both for ſatisfaction and comfort: What plainer teſtimony, or fairer character can be written to ſhew the qualification of Infants of believers, then to write them holy, and give them the ſame name that is given to Chriſt, and Saints in Heaven and Earth?

CHAP. VIII.

The Harmonie that notable Chapter, Rom. 11. *hath with the former Scriptures; the* 15, 16, 17, *verſes eſpecially opened.*

THAT the Adverſaries of this truth may ſee we want not a harmonie of Scriptures to confirm our judgement, the next place to be conſidered of is that, *Rom.* 11. eſpecially ver. 15,16 17. of that Chapter; which if well weighed, will demonſtrate the holineſs and Church-memberſhip of the Children of believing Gentiles, as much as of the Jews Children that deſcended naturally from *Abraham.*

The ſcope of the whole Chapter is to diſcover the breaking off, or caſting away of the Iewiſh Nation from being a Church, and the priviledge the Gentiles get by this, & their ingraffing into the ſame root; and the promiſe of the reſtauration of the Iews again, when the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhould come in; and every one of theſe expreſt with variety of notions, and interlined with many cautions concerning Gods actings in this great diſpenſation. Concerning the full explication of this Chapter, Mr. *Cobbet* and Mr. *Baxter* have done worthily, and have

have with much clearneſs argued for Infants Church-membership from it. I ſhall onely for methods ſake, and your ſatisfaction, open the main and moſt controverted terms in this Chapter concerning this ſubject. As,

1. What this breaking off, or caſting away of the Iews imports, and from what they are broken off; from the viſible or inviſible Church, v. 15.

2. What is meant by the firſt fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches; and how it can be affirmed, that if the root be holy, ſo are the branches, v. 16.

3. What this ingraffing is, and how the Gentiles are ſaid to be ingrafted, and to be partakers of the fatneſs of the Olive, v. 17. For the firſt, This caſting off, and breaking off, is not from the inviſible, but the viſible Church.

1. This will maintain falling away from grace, and pleaſe the Arminians, the great Enemies of the Goſpel of free grace: but this the Apoſtle prevents, ver. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. by anticipation of that Objection, diſtinguiſhing the Elect, and himſelf as one of them, from being caſt off: *I ſay then, hath God caſt away his people whom he foreknew? God forbid. I alſo am an Iſraelite, &c.* If the caſting off meant here was from the inviſible Church, then *Paul* and the other Elect among the Iews were caſt off from that Church; but *God forbid*, ſaith *Paul*, v. 5. there is a remnant at this preſent time according to the election of grace, whereof *Paul* was one; therefore it muſt be from the

the visible Church they were broken off: But here the *Arminians* and *Pelagians* agree with these that are against Infant-baptism, as they do in many other opinions. Mr. *Tombes* hath nothing to say in his *Examen* of Mr. *Marshals* Sermon, to avoid this absurdity, but only this, pag. 64.

The meaning is not (saith he) *of some of the branches in the invisible Church; but as when our Saviour Christ using the same similitude, says*, Joh 15.2. Every branch in me not bearing fruit, he taketh away: *The meaning is, not that any branch in him could be fruitless, or taken away; but he calleth that a branch in him, which was so in appearance: so the Apostle speaking of branches broken off, means it not of such as were truly so, but so in appearance.* Thus far he.

Which is a granting of what he denies; for to be a branch in appearance, is only to be a visible branch; and no branch that is meerly in appearance so, and not really, is one of the invisible Church, nor can ever be said to be broken from it, but only from his visible state which he hath, but (ὡς κλῆμα) v. 15. 16. as a branch in outward priviledges, and seeming graces.

2. The breaking off, &c. it was of the Jewish Nation, of the collective body, though not of every individual, and therefore it must needs be from the visible Church; for as a Nation they were a Church, and the whole Nation was cast away and rejected; now as a Nation they were not all members of the invisible Church, ver. 7, 8. with ver. 17.

3. Its

3. Its a visible breaking off, therefore cannot be from the invisible Church, ver. 3, 4, 5. 17, 18, 19. For as Mr. *Baxter* well observes, *There can be no visible removing from an invisible term.*

4. Its a breaking off the natural branches, so he calls the Jews: Now the body of the Jewish Church were not natural branches in a spiritual sense; for they believed not as *Abraham* did; but only called so as they were naturally descended from his loyns, and were members of the visible Church, and first partakers of the outward priviledges of the Covenant made with him: Thus the Apostle distinguisheth of the body of the Jewish Nation, *Rom.* 9. where after he had reckoned up al the priviledges of the Israelites in general, ver. 4, *Who are Israelites, to whom pertains the adoption and the glory, and the Covenants, &c.* making way by this to shew the sadness of their rejection, in ver. the 6. to prevent the same Objection, the Apostle in this Chapter saith, *They are not all* Israel *which are of* Israel; that is, not all spiritual, though all natural branches; and these priviledges did visibly belong to all. As for that distinction of *Abrahams* being a natural and a spiritual Father, it may go for currant until they come to apply it, and then it is most vain; for all that came from *Abraham* as a natural Father, had a title to all these priviledges forementioned, which belonged to the visible Church until they did degenerate, and cast themselves out, as *Ishmael* and *Esau, &c.* But of this formerly.

Lastly, If they were broken off from the invisible Church,

Church, it must be either from union with Christ, or communion with Christ and his Spirit; for this is the true definition of the invisible Church, that in it souls have real union and commmunion with God in Christ through the Spirit: but none of the Jews that were broken off had such a union or communion, and therefore could not be broken off from it: But so far they may be said to be brokrn off from the invisible Church, as by remote consequence, as they were excluded from all the means of grace, and the Ordinances; which are the usual ways and methods of God to bring souls into communion with himself.

2. Let us consider what is meant by the first fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches; There be many opinions concerning this, especially two must be debated; some think it Christ, as these that follow *Origen*, and the allegorical Fathers: But that firstly and primarily by the first fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches, cannot be meant Christ neither personally not mystically, is most clear if we consider,

Ego aliam sanctam radicem nescio, nisi Dominum nostrum. Orig.

1. Iesus Christ was not the first fruits in regard of the whole lump of the Iewish Nation, and so cannot answer to the first similitude.

2. Iesus Christ cannot be said to be root unto these which were cast away; no branches really in him are cut off, but so were they; for that place of the

the 15. of *John*, ver. 2. which ſeemeth to ſpeak of ſome branches which are in Chriſt, and yet are taken away for not bearing fruit: it may be better read, and according to the *Syriack*, thus; *Every branch that brings not forth fruit in me, he takes away*; that is, that do bring forth ſome ſeeming fruit, but not as in Chriſt as root and principle.

3. In ver. 24. the Iews when they ſhall be called, its ſaid, *They ſhall be graffed into their own Olive*: Now Chriſt is not properly their own Olive, but ſo is *Abraham*, &c.

4. The Iews are ſaid (as formerly) to be natural branches of this root, but ſo they were not of Chriſt; but Chriſt was a natural branch from that ſtock, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Whoſe are the Fathers; of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came.*

Mr. *Tombes* himſelf ingenuouſly confeſſeth this, page 67. of his *Examen*, *That by the root cannot be meant Chriſt*; and gives us the hint of another argument from thoſe expreſſions, v. 24. of ſome branches, wild κατὰ φύσιν, *according to nature*; and of ingraffing in, παρὰ φύσιν, *contrary to nature*, into this Olive; he concludes the root cannot be Chriſt: for Chriſt hath no natural or preternatural branches in him; all are wild ere they be ingraffed into him as a living root: And the other expreſſion, v. 18. of our not bearing the root, but the root us, if we boaſt againſt the Iews, doth evidently demonſtrate, that the root here is not properly meant of Chriſt, though he be the eternal root of all ſpiritual happineſs,

ſet

set forth gloriously in many other places of Scripture.

Others by the root mean the Covenant: But the best and most genuine sense is to interpret it of *Abraham*; with whom, and with his seed, as so many branches, the Covenant was made, and by which both the root and the branches were made holy: And this answers fully to both the similitudes. For,

1. It's an allusion to the Legal rights about the first fruits which were to be offered up to God; and by that all the whole mass, all the fruits that came after were accounted holy: Thus *Abraham* was the first fruits of the Jews: he believing first, and being in Covenant, all the lump, the whole body of the Jewish Nation were taken in to be a Church, and were accounted holy.

2. As a root it answers to him from whom all the Jews sprang up, and from whom they drew all their Church priviledges, as their breath: Thus the Lord by the Prophet in *Isa.* 51. 1, 2. bids the Jews to *look to the rock out of which they were hewen, and the pit out of which they were digged*: he means it of *Abraham* first, as appears by the second verse; *Look to* Abraham *your Father, and to* Sarah *that bare you; for I called him alone, and blessed and increased him*, &c.

Ob. But what kind of consequence is this? and how doth the Apostle make use of this? *If the first fruits be holy, so is the lump; and if the root be holy, so are the branches*: From what principle doth the Apostle argue?

Sol.

Sol. The Apoſtle in the former verſe ſpeaks of a receiving in again of the Jewiſh Nation, and brings in this as a ground to hope for it, *There is yet a holy root which hath an influence on the branches; and argues, that if the root be holy, when the branches broken off ſhall be re-ingraffed, they ſhall be holy likewiſe.* The like phraſe you have in v. 28. *As touching the Goſpel, they are enemies for your ſake; but as touching the Election, they are beloved,* διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, *for their Fathers ſake; God having ſo caſt his Election, as to run in that vein moſt eminently*: And ſome do render it, *They are beloved through their Fathers*: But this is clear;

1. That *Abraham*, or as ſome ſay, *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were the root.

2. That he argues from the holineſs of the root, to the holineſs of the branches: that is, from them as Parents, to their poſterity as Branches.

3. That this was an uſual and common principle of arguing in Scripture, from the Parent to the Poſterity; for elſe he had ſpoken in the dark, and had proved *notum per ignotius*, if they could not univerſally reaſon from it; and if you obſerve, he writes it as an Axiom of the greateſt demonſtration, and never ſtands to prove it further.

4. It had been an argument of no force for to prove the calling in of the Iews, and their happy ſtate upon re-ingraffing, to tell them, *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches; and they are beloved for the Fathers ſake*, if there were not a virtue ſtill in the root

to

to derive holineſs to them, when they ſhould be received in, and ingraffed to their own Olive; he lays all the weight on the root, being ſtill holy and freſh, though the branches be broken off. And what can you make of this as to argumentation? *If the root be holy*, Ergo *the branches*; and apply it to Perſons, and Parents, but in a moral and imputative conſideration.

Ob. But holineſs is not propagated by nature, from the Parent to his Child; and we all derive ſin by nature from our Parents; and are, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Eph.* 2.2. *by nature the Children of Wrath, &c.* and as *David* ſaith, *Conceived in ſin.*

Sol. 1. It's true, we are ſo; and there is no holineſs propagated by nature, take it for internal habits; as a wiſe man doth not convey his wiſdom, or a vertuous man his vertues to his Child, neither can a Believer convey his faith and other graces to his Child; and in this ſenſe *Abraham* is not a root, he begets no believer; and under this conſideration the argument cannot hold; *Abraham* in this ſenſe is only a root, παραδειγματικῶς, *exemplary only*; Chriſt is ἐνεργητικῶς, *effectually*, *to convey ſimilar graces*: But,

2. There is a holineſs by gratious eſtimation or imputation, which flows from Gods Covenant, or ſome ſpecial priviledge given to ſuch a ſtock, or kindred, or Nation; God taking ſuch a family, ſuch a ſtock, and ſeparates it to himſelf for ſome holy uſe, and ſo bleſſeth them: And thus it was with *Abra-*

ham,

here, and is moſt common in the Scriptures, and according to the nature of priviledges among men; where the ſon of a Freeman is free, and the ſon of a Nobleman a Nobleman; and by way of alluſion; (though it doth not hold in all particulars) as in juſtification, Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed, and we accounted holy by it: So as to ſome ſpecial priviledges, the root, the Parent being holy, and in the Covenant, his Child hath the advantage of it; not meritoriouſly from the Parents faith, but virtually through Gods gracious promiſe to the Believer and his ſeed. But,

3. This is not by natural generation, for then it ſhould be to all Children; but by grace and proportion; its Gods good pleaſure thus to derive the priviledge, and out of ſpecial reſpect to the Parents; and to encourage them in their own faith, and ſtrengthen them in their hopes concerning their ſeed: thus did God chooſe out *Abraham* and his family from all the world, and bleſſed him; yet it was not from nature his ſeed were more bleſſed then all the world beſides. But as Dr. *Willet* ſaith well on this place, *The branches are holy becauſe of this holy root; not by an actual and inherent holineſs, but by a prerogative of grace grounded on the promiſe of God made to believing Fathers and their ſeed; which is the ſame in the New Teſtament as in the Old*; and in this ſenſe the argument is ſtrong, and enforcing the ſcope of the Apoſtle. So that though the generation be natural, the derivation of a Title to Church priviledges,

and the characteristical note of holiness is given them by grace in the Covenant, which takes in the branches with the root. In no sense besides can this argument be true, without you make the root Christ: which you see cannot be meant in this place without great absurdities.

The third and special term to be opened, is, what this ingraffing is of the Gentiles into the root, and how they are ingraffed? v. 17, 19.

For the understanding of this, Mr. *Marshall* hath laid down a sure position, which neither Mr. *Tombes*, *who is the most learned Adversary of this Truth*, nor any other hath or can shake; and that is, *That the ingraffing in of the Gentiles must be sutable to the breaking off the Jews; as they were broken off, so are we ingraffed*: This the Apostle clearly proves in every verse. In v. 17. *Thou being a wilde Olive*, speaking of the Gentiles collectively considered, wert ingraffed, ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in, amongst them*; so *Grotius* translates it, *Positus es inter ramos illius arboris*, Thou art set among the branches of that tree; and so referring to the first words of the verse, which is implyed, that some remained still; for but some of the branches were broken off, and the Gentile believers were inoculated among them, and by a special adoption were partakers of the same priviledges; according to that of the Poet *Ovid*:

Venerit insitio: fac ramum, ramus adoptet.

But the best reference is to the former part of the verse,

verſe, as it ſpeaks of theſe branches which were broken off; the believing Gentiles were ingraffed, (ἐν αὐτοῖς) that is, as *Beza* and the *Syriack* tranſlates it, *pro ipſis*, for them, that is, *in ramorum defractorum locum*, in the room or ſtead of the branches which were broken off; they were taken away, we ingraffed: Others tranſlate it, *cum illis*, with them, which remained when we were inſerted: but either interpretation will become the ſenſe of the place.

Now the reaſons which flow from this Text concerning the ſubject which we have in hand, may be eaſier ſlighted then anſwered: This poſition being laid down, *We believing Gentiles are ingraffed into* Abrahams *Covenant, in the room of the natural branches which were broken off*: Now,

1. The Jews and their children were broken off from the Church, their children being members as well as themſelves; therefore believing Gentiles and their children are ingraffed in, the ingraffing in is ſutable to the breaking off: they have nibbled about this reaſon; but the beſt of the Adverſaries have never ſaid any thing yet, as to ſatisfie a rational Saint.

2. Some branches were not broken off; for ſo it's implyed, in that he ſaith, *If ſome were broken off*; and if they were not broken off, then not their children; for it was not only a breaking off perſonally, but of ſucceſſion, and of their poſterity with themſelves: Now if we be ingraffed among theſe, or with theſe that are not broken off, we and our

Children must likewise be ingrafted in; else there will be a schism between Jew and Gentile, in enjoying the priviledges naturally flowing from the same root: No man will be so bold as to say, that the believing Jews were broken off; and if not they, then not their Children which were then Infants, and had not acted unbelief: For either they must be broken off for their own sins, or their Fathers; not for their Fathers, for some of them were believers, and not broken off; not for themselves, for some of them were Infants; therefore some Infants were not broken off; for their Fathers continued in the faith; and we believing Gentiles are ingrafted in among them; therefore our Children also.

3. In the latter end, when the Jews shall be ingrafted in again to their own Olive, which is promised in this Chapter, they and their Children shall be taken in, v. 26. *And so all* Israel *shall be saved*; and our ingrafting in is still suitable to theirs.

4. The Gentiles are said to partake of the root, and the fatness of the Olive tree, in the same verse: this (Συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης) signifies the full participation and fellowship in all the priviledges and advanteges of the root, as the Jews had. Now their priviledge was not personal to themselves, but to their posterity, and therein lay the fatness of that Olive, in the fulness and large extent of its priviledge and seminal vertue, that it comprehended Parent and Child. So that as the Jews casting off was not only personal, but Politique, that is, of them and theirs;

so

ſo our ingraffing in their room is; and as they had the fatneſs of the root and Olive once, ſo have we: Now we could not be ſaid to be, (Συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης, καὶ τῆς πότητος τῆς ἐλαίας) *To have a mutual fellowſhip with the Jews in the root and fatneſs of it*, if we be only perſonally ingraffed, and they and theirs broken off œconomically; if there be a fellowſhip, it muſt be at leaſt in ſubſtantials: And this was the moſt eminent and ſubſtantial priviledge of the Iews, that they and their poſterity were taken into the ſame Covenant: The Apoſtle opens this further in *Eph.* 3 6.

And eſpecially, if we remember, that their breaking off, and our ingraffing, is into the viſible Church, as is formerly proved, and muſt needs be granted; for all that were broken off, were not broken off from election, and the inviſible Church; neither are all the Gentiles which are ingraffed in, elected, and really of the inviſible Church. So that the reſult is this;

1. That there is a real ingraffing of the believing Gentiles into the ſame root from which the unbelieving Iews were broken off.

2. This breaking off was from the viſible Church, and its priviledges, not from the inviſible; ſo is the ingraffing of us into the viſible Church.

3. As their caſting out was of them and their poſterity, ſo is our graffing in of us and our Children; Theſe concluſions flow naturally from the Text; and all other deductions will be but as dregs after the ſpirits are extracted.

4. And

4. And to add to the reſt this conſideration, That if the poſterity of the Gentiles be not taken in, as the Jews were, there will be the greateſt inequality of the communication of the fatneſs of the root that can be imagined; and the Jews may rather boaſt againſt the believing Gentiles, then they againſt them; ſeeing the root conveyed priviledges to them and their poſterity, but only perſonal priviledges to the believing Gentile; to the one a double mercy, to the other only a ſingle.

Ob. But this great Objection may be made; No believer is now a root as *Abraham*, he is but only a branch; and therefore its not to be conceived how it can be argued from this to every believer, *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches*, as it may be to *Abraham*.

Sol. It's granted, every believer, nor any, cannot properly be called the root, as *Abraham* was, and in a ſtrict ſenſe: Yet,

1. They are ingraffed into the ſame root, and convey the ſame priviledges to their branches, as *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and the *twelve Tribes* did to their poſterities, who were not properly nor abſolutely the root, but branches of it; and we all know, that a Slip well inoculated or ingraffed, becomes afterwards a natural branch; and receives as much from the root, as theſe which grew naturally on it: So that its as ſtrong to argue on the Gentiles ſide after ingraffing; *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches*; as from *Abraham* to the Jews, who were natural branches;

branches; As an adopted ſon, him and his have as full a title to the inheritance as a natural ſon.

There is only this difference between the conveyance of priviledges of the Jews as natural branches, and the ingraffed Gentiles; That the whole body of the Jews, good and bad, were called branches; now only *Believers of the Gentiles*, who are called by the Goſpel, with their children, are ingraffed into that root.

2. Though every Believer is not the proper root, but only a branch of that root; yet for being ingraffed, he is naturalized as the Jewiſh branch, and ſo muſt have the ſame priviledge.

3. There are branches of branches; and the pooreſt branch hath ſome twigs, and ſpreading ſprigs growing from them which are of the ſame conſideration, and do receive of the fatneſs of the root as well as the main branches; and in this ſenſe every branch may be ſaid to be the immediate root of the leſſer twigs: Thus believers ingraffed into the root, are holy, and their Infants that are branches of the branches immediatly ſprouting forth from them, are holy alſo, and under the ſame conſideration; and the argument holds ſtill for the ingraffed branches, as for the natural.

And as Mr. *Blake* ſaith well, *The branches of Anceſtors are roots of poſterity; being made a holy branch, in reference to their iſſue, they become a holy root.* This might be much more enlarged, but that I would not be voluminous; its enough that believers are

ingraffed with their Children into the ſame root, as is formerly proved.

And then the argument holds firm, That theſe that are in the root, muſt partake of the fatneſs of it; and they which are in the Covenant, cannot be denied the priviledges of it.

CHAP. IX.

Wherein Mr. Tombes *his eight Arguments in his* Apology *againſt Mr.* Marſhal, *for the ingraffing in, mentioned* v. 17. *to be of the Gentiles into the inviſible Church by election and ſaving faith, are examined and anſwered.*

THE great endeavor of theſe who are of the contrary opinion in opening this Chapter, is, To prove that the ingraffing of the Gentiles into the root is by election and ſaving faith, and ſo into the inviſible Church; for they ſee their caſe is in hazard if it ſhould be meant of the viſible Church: And therefore, though enough be ſpoken before to prove what we affirm; yet becauſe Mr. *Tombes* hath laid down eight Arguments with ſo much confidence on the

the other ſide as unanſwerable; I think it not amiſs to beſtow one Chapter in the diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of his reaſons, that the truth may have a fairer paſſage into your underſtanding without clouds or demurs.

His firſt reaſon is, *Apologie p.* 71. *That ingraffing which is by Gods ſole power, it is into the inviſible Church: but ſo is the ingraffing of the Jews,* ver. 3. Ergo. *For God is able to graff them.*

Sol. 1. As to argue from Gods power to his will, is always unſound in Divinity and in Reaſon; God is able, therefore he will: So,

2. To argue from power to election, is of the ſame nature; for election is ſeldom or never attributed to Gods power, but to his will or good pleaſure.

3. To argue from Gods power in general, to the putting of it forth abſolutely in ſuch a determinate act, is as ſtrange; God is able to graff them in, *Ergo* it muſt be into the inviſible Church; as if God ſhewed nothing of his power, but in the workings of ſaving grace; eſpecially if we conſider what a power it is, and only from God: But to take the very prejudice the Iews have even from the letter of the Goſpel to bring them but to confeſs Chriſt after ſo long a darkneſs, as it was in the beginning of the Goſpel, but to make the Gentiles but outwardly own and profeſs the Goſpel, and yet not members of

of the invisible Church; to take away the very grosness of naturall darkness and ignorance, is a work of mighty power; And to an outward conversion, where persons have been long under the power of darkness, there needs the sole power of God.

4. The Apostle may well put in rather Gods power then his will, when he speaks of the ingraffing in of the Jews; for it will require an act of power to gather them but visibly once again, and bring them into one entire body to make a visible Church, when they are so scattered up and down all Nations; and at such a distance one from another, that it is as the gathering of the bones of dead men; and so its likened to the resurrection from the dead, v. 15. So that we need go no further to enquire why their ingraffing should be attributed to Gods power, seeing there is need enough of a Divine power but to gather them together from the four winds, to make a collective body, and so to be a visible Church.

Besides, when the Apostle speaks of power in working of saving faith, he doth put other Epithites to set it forth: and not only barely speaks of power which God puts forth in all acts, but exceeding greatness of power, *Eph.* 1. 21, 22.

Arg. 2. His second Argument is, *That ingraffing, which is called reconciliation, opposite to casting away, that is by election and giving faith: but so is the ingraffing called*, v. 15.

Sol.

Sol. If he means reconciliation in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as it denotes pardon of ſins, and being made friends with God by Chriſts attonement and mediatorſhip: which muſt be his ſenſe if he ſpeak like himſelf: Then many abſurdities may follow.

1. That the Jews and their rejection was the ground of the Gentiles reconciliation unto God.

2. That no reconciliation was obtained for the Gentiles before the Iews were broken off.

3. That thoſe which are reconciled, and their ſins pardoned, may be caſt off; for ſo were the Iews; and the Gentiles threatned with the ſame miſery on the ſame ground, v. 20.

4. As there is external and eternal ſalvation ſpoken of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. ſo there may be an outward and inward reconciliation; the Gentiles were caſt out from the viſible Church for ſo many hundreds of years, without any hope or promiſe, *And ſtrangers to the Commonwealth of* Iſrael, *Epheſ.* 2. 11, 12. and ſo viſibly caſt off; and it was a great reconciliation but to break down the middle wall of partition between Iew and Gentile, as to viſible priviledges and Ordinances: And ſo by the reconciling the world may be more properly meant the bringing them in under the means of the Goſpel, and the outward diſpenſations of the Church; which is Gods common way and method of ſalvation; and which to ſome is real and effectual unto inward grace, unto others only to outward priviledges.

And the very phraſe, *the reconciliation of the World*,

to

to Orthodox ears, deafens and daſheth the other interpretation; for the body of the Gentile-world (which he mean) are not ſo reconciled as by election and ſaving grace, though the ſound of the Goſpel hath gone through all the world.

Ob. 3. *Thirdly*, ſaith he, *the ingraffing muſt be meant of that act whereby the branch ſtands in the tree as a branch: but that is by giving of faith. The minor is proved alſo*, v.20. *they were broken off by unbelief, and we ſtand by faith, &c.*

Sol. Its true, the ingraffing is by faith, as their breaking off was by unbelief: but as their unbelief was ſhewn in a publique rejection of the Goſpel, and by it they and their Children were broken off: ſo the Gentiles are ingraffed in by publique profeſſion of faith, and acceptation of the Goſpel for themſelves and their Children; and this muſt needs be the Apoſtles meaning: For,

1. Ver.18. He bids the Genriles not to boaſt againſt the branches that were broken off. Now how could they boaſt againſt them but for viſible priviledges? inviſible, are out of cognizance to others: Do Saints boaſt againſt one another for election and reprobation? theſe ſecrets of the Almighty: This Argument Mr. *Baxter* urgeth with much advantage, in his Book.

2. In *v.*19. he explains further what the nature of their boaſting might be; thou wilt ſay, The branches were

were broken off, that I might be ingraffed: now can any man conceive they ſhould boaſt becauſe the branches the Jews were broken from election and true faith, that they might be graffed in by a new act of Gods election, and by true and ſaving faith? So in ver. 20, 21, 22, 23. he exhorts the Gentiles *to look to their ſtanding, and to take heed leſt they be broken off alſo; For if God ſpared not the natural branches, &c. much leſ will he ſpare thee*: What, are they exhorted to look leaſt they be cut off from Gods election &c? Will Mr. *Tombes* turn a downright *Arminian* that he may have any plea againſt the baptizing of poor Infants?

There is a twofold way of ingraffing, either by ſpiritual implantation into Chriſt, or by viſible profeſſion of faith; and both theſe ſhould meet in one perſon, though they may alſo be ſeparated; a viſible Profeſſor may not have ſaving faith within, *yet may have*: So here, the ingraffing in is into the viſible Church by viſible profeſſion; among which ſome are, ſome are not inviſible members: but the very *terminus* of ingraffing is not into the inviſible, but the viſible Church; for neither the Apoſtle, nor an Angel could tell who were ingraffed into the inviſible Church, nor who broken off, but only from the viſible Church, firſt as the proper term, and then by conſequence from the inviſible; for from this Church none were abſolutely broken off that ever were in, and into it few ingraffed.

So that if the ingraffing be viſible, the term muſt be

be visible also: but the ingraffing is visible, *Ergo* the term is so: This is according to Mr. *Tombes* his own form of argumentation, from the term to the ingraffing; the major is proved before.

Ob. *Fourthly, That ingraffing is meant,* v. 17. *whereby the wild Olive is co-partaker of the root and fatness of the Olive; but such is only election and saving faith;* he proves the minor, by distinguishing who the root is, which he well affirms to be *Abraham.*

Sol: To which there needs no other Answer then what Mr *Blake* hath given him; *If the root be* Abraham, *and the ingraffing in be only by election, and derivation of saving graces* (which he means by *the fatness of the Olive*) *then it must be that we are all elect in* Abraham *as a common root;* Abraham *may say, Without me you can do nothing.*

To which Mr. *Tombes* only answers by confession, *That it would follow if he made* Abraham *a root as Christ, communicating saving faith: But I make* Abraham *a root as the Father of Believers, not by begetting faith, but as an exemplary cause.* How poor an evasion is this of so confident a man in his opinion, I submit to judgement.

Let him mind his Argument, and the force of it; *That ingraffing is meant whereby the wild Olive is partaker of the fatness of the root: but that is only election and saving grace, &c.*

1. Were

1. Were not the natural branches which were broken off partakers of the fatneſs of the root? and were they all elected and partakers of ſaving graces, or outward priviledges only? and why then ſhould it be thought abſurd for the Gentiles by ingraffing to partake of the fatneſs of the root only in outward priviledges, ſeeing it was ſo with the natural branches, and they all grow on the ſame root?

2. The old abſurdity will ariſe ſtill from this, *That Saints may fall away from election and ſaving grace.*

3. How can he imagine *Abraham* to be the root, and the fatneſs of the root to be election and ſaving graces, and that engraffing the way of being copartakers with the root, and yet deny Mr. *Blakes* Argument, *That we are elected in* Abraham?

1. Its improper to call a root an exemplary cauſe; there is no harmonie between them; an example conveyes nothing; here is a conveyance of fatneſs.

2. How unſutable to good language is it to ſay, That ſuch are partakers of the fatneſs or fulneſs of an example? can we think the Apoſtle would ſo far over-reach?

3. Were the Iews partakers of the fatneſs of *Abraham* in the Covenant, meerly as from an Exemplary cauſe? had not they it from him as a natural Father, God making the Covenant with him and his ſeed? and do not ingraffed branches afterwards become as natural?

He

He only adds, p. 73. *That if it were meant of outward priviledges it were false; for the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges of* Abraham.

Sol. *Abraham* is a root in the New Testament as well as in the Old, and still stands by virtue of the Covenant to Believers and their Children: And though Old Testament Ordinances were taken away with the Iews, and that Church state, yet the root is not taken away; but the New Testament priviledges grow on the same root; and our ingraffing in gives us to be partakers of the fatness of them, as well as it gave to the Iews the participation of former priviledges until they were broken off.

All the rest of his Arguments are much of the same nature; only a touch further of each of them.

Ob. 5. From v. 25. *If the breaking off the Jews be by blinding, then the ingraffing is by giving faith; but the former is true, so the latter.*

Sol. This is the same in effect with the third Argument: Yet,

1. There is not the same reason, seeing he takes it of giving saving faith; their blinding was judicial, a punishment for their unbelieving, rejecting of the Gospel, though they had not saving faith to embrace the Gospel; the giving of saving faith is not on such terms; neither is saving faith so absolutely

antecedent

antecedent to make a man a member of the visible Church, as blinding is to Gods final rejection.

2. Blindness came but in part on *Israel*; it fell onely on the meer visible members, not the invisible and elect: therefore the ingraffing must be onely of visible members into the visible Church, v. 7. The election hath obtained it, but the rest were blinded.

Arg. 6. *If re-ingraffing of the Jews produceth salvation, is by turning them from their iniquity, &c. then it is to the invisible Church: but so it is,* v. 26, 27. Ergo.

Sol. To which I give this fair Answer, That doubtless according to those promises, when the Jews shall be called in to be a visible Church again, there shall be abundance of more glory be brought in with them, then ever yet the world saw; and the new Heavens and the new Earth, the coming down of the new *Jerusalem*, and all those glorious things are fitted to fall in with that time. And from these considerations many do interpret v. 26. literally, *And so shall all* Israel *be saved.* But yet,

1. They shall be ingrafted in as a visible Church; else *Abraham* and the Fathers would never be mentioned as roots.

2. They shall be ingrafted in as they were broken off: now they were broken off as a visible Church.

3. All that can be gathered is this, That the fulneſs of ſalvation, and the virtues of the promiſes, ſhall more fully and univerſally take effect on the Jews, even to the ſalvation of all of them; and ſo the inviſible and viſible Church be more pure, *and as one in the earth*: but this fulneſs ſhall be to them as a viſible Church, and on the earth.

Arg. 7. *If the re-ingraffing be by vertue of Gods election and love, then it is to the inviſible Church: but the former is true*, v. 28. Ergo.

Sol. 1. It's ſaid, That as touching election, the Jews are beloved for their Fathers ſake; hence it follows, God hath a love of election to Believers, and their natural ſeed; for ſo the Jews were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*. But,

2. It's granted that the calling of the Jews ſhall be according to Gods election and firſt love; and that Gods election ſhall more fully take hold of the Jews at their re-calling, then of any Nation: but yet ſtill the Argument is of no force to prove that their re-ingraffing, and ſo ours, is only or firſtly into the inviſible Church; for they are elected as well to be a viſible Church, as to be partakers of inward graces; and their re-ingraffing muſt be ſpecially and firſtly into the viſible Church from which they were broken off, or elſe there will be no correſpondence between their rejection and re-ingraffing.

The

The laſt and weakeſt Argument is this; *If the ingraffing of Jews and Gentiles be the fruit of Gods mercy, the breaking off by ſhutting up in unbelief; then it is into the inviſible Church by election, &c. but ſo it is.* Ergo.

Sol. You ſee he hath ſpent his ſtock and ſtrength to be ſo low at laſt: This Argument needs no Anſwer, but by ſhewing you the unſoundneſs of this univerſal propoſition on which the Argument is built. *Whatever is a fruit of Gods mercy, is from election, and ingraffing into the inviſible Church:* Which propoſition is moſt falſe, univerſally conſidered: Are not health, meat and drink, preſervation, all outward priviledges, fruits of Gods mercy? Is not long-ſuffering to theſe that periſh, and the affording the means of grace and ſalvation, the inſtitution of Ordinances, fruits of Gods mercy? and yet muſt they be given onely to elect ones? and do they ingraff to the inviſible Church? but *ſatis eſt repetere*: you have ſeen the utmoſt ſtrength of the greateſt Antagoniſt to the Truth we hold out.

Chap. X.

The Harmonie of Mat. 19. 13, 14. *with* Mar. 10. 13. *and* Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17. *concerning the bringing of Infants to Christ, his acts to them, how far it contributes to prove Infant-baptism.*

YOU have seen how the Scriptures agree in holding out some special priviledges in the New Testament, as in the Old, to Believers and their seed: Let us now come to view Christs own carriage and actions to Infants; which shews both the special respect he had to them, and would have his Ministers and Churches to have likewise. For this, compare *Mat.* 19. 13, 14. *Mar.* 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. with *Luk.* 18. 15, 16, 17. *Where, when little Children were brought to Christ, and his Disciples did forbid them, Christ was angry, and charged them not to hinder them, for theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven; and he took them up in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and blessed them.* For the opening this place more clearly, Consider,

1. Who they were which were brought to Christ.

2. Who brought them.

3. Why the Disciples did forbid them to be brought.

4. Christs

4. Christs reason why he would have them not hindred.

5. Christs actions to and on them, what they amount unto.

For the first, who they were which were brought to Christ; in *Mark* they are called παιδία, and well translated *little Children*, or Infants; the word is a diminutive word, and is specially to be applied to Infants, *Luk.* 1.76. *Zacharias* useth the same word of *John*, when he was newly born; *And thou Child (παιδίον) shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest*, &c. *Videtur esse aliqua emphasis diminutivi, hoc saltem loco minime negligenda*, saith *Beza*. The same word is given to Christ when he was in the manger, *Mat.* 2.11. *The Wise men found* παιδίον, *the young Child*, or Infant, *with* Mary, &c. *Heb.* 11.23. *Moses* is called παιδίον, when he was hid among the Flags. This word, saith *Hippocrates*, is given to these which are under the age of seven years; and it's mostly used among the Evangelists for to express the tenderest age of man, which is Infancy: So *Spanhem. dub. Evang.* But in *Luke* the holy Ghost useth another word of full signification for Infants (τὰ βρέφη) which word is used for a Babe in the womb, an Embryo, *Luk.* 1. 41. *When* Elizabeth *heard the salutation of* Mary, *the Babe leaped in her womb*; ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς; it's the same word: but more properly it is used for a Child newly born, a sucking Babe that

Παιδίον, teste Hippocrate, de primo vitæ septennio dicitur; παῖς autem de secundo. Gurti.

we carry in our arms: Thus 2 *Tim* 3.15. *Timothy* is ſaid *to know the Scriptures from a Child*, ἀπὸ βρέφους, *from his Infancy*; not when he was an Infant, but from his Infancy; that is, as ſoon as ever he was paſt a Babe, and came to underſtand any thing, he was learnt the Scriptures. The ſame word, βρέφος, is given alſo to Chriſt, when the Wiſe men found him in ſwadling clouts, *Luk.* 2.12. So that this is moſt clear, that they were Infants, tender young ones, Babes which were brought to Chriſt; And if the two words did not properly ſignifie Infants, yet in that it's ſaid they were brought to Chriſt, would prove it; for the word προσφέρειν, properly ſignifies *to carry*, as it's uſed moſtly in Scripture for. But,

2. Who thoſe were that brought them, it's moſt probable that their Parents brought them; and theſe had believed themſelves, or made ſome profeſſion of faith; for they bring them to Chriſt to be under his bleſſing, for ſome ſpecial favour to be ſhewn by Chirſt to them; it was for a ſpiritual end they brought them, to be touched by Chriſt, &c. to have ſome virtue from him; and who could have ſuch bowels to bring Infants to Chriſt, but their own Parents? and to abide the frowns of the Diſciples, and their checks, but Parents, who love their Children next themſelves, and would have them bleſſed together with them? ſo that it's more probable it was their Parents which brought them then any others; and that they were Believers, who had ſuch a ſenſe of their Infants conditions, and of Chriſts reſpects.

And

And beſides, they were then in the Coaſts of *Judea*, where many had profeſt their faith, and were baptized by *John*, and longed to have their Infants confirmed by Jeſus Chriſt; eſpecially when we look on *Mat.* 19. 13. *They brought them to Chriſt to lay his hands on them, and pray over them.*

3. If we conſider why the Diſciples ſhould forbid them, and rebuked theſe that brought them; ſurely it could not be out of any cruelty to Infants, or that the Diſciples had no bowels to Infants, or deſire they might not be happy with their Parents; their affections could not be ſo ſtraightned and bound up in unnaturalneſs: but it muſt be from ſome ſuch principle which theſe of the contrary judgement take up, That they were not capable, and were firſt to be taught; That onely grown men, and Profeſſors of faith, were fit for Ordinances; and therefore they rebuked or chid them, and forbad them to do ſo any more: As if they had ſaid, What have we to do with Children, as to outward Ordinances? they are not capable, they cannot profeſs their faith; and we muſt have perſons able to hold forth the Goſpel, which muſt be viſible ſubjects of Chriſts Kingdom: Doubtleſs ſome ſuch grounds they muſt needs go on, or elſe they muſt ſhew a ſtrange kinde of paſſion againſt Children, moſt unbecoming theſe which had but the rags of natural affection left in them.

4. See Chriſts affections to them, and the reaſon of it; *When Chriſt ſaw it* (ἠγανάκτησε) *he was much diſpleaſed:* It's a word that is uſed to expreſs ſuch a

kinde of ſorrow as breaks the heart; alſo to ſtomach any thing, and to have the ſpirit raiſed in contempt of an unworthy action or perſon: Thus Chriſt was grieved at them, and he looked with contempt on his Diſciples, as dealing moſt unworthily with poor Infants, in forbidding them to be brought to Chriſt; and therefore he commands them to ſuffer them to bring Infants to him, and not to forbid them. Theſe two words ſhews how vehement Chriſt was, and how much his heart was ſet towards Infants. You finde ſometimes that Chriſt gave ſome ſharp words to his Diſciples, and to *Peter* eſpecially; but never to have his ſpirit to riſe in indignation againſt them, as when they would forbid Infants to be brought to him; and that which makes Chriſt ſo earneſt, muſt needs be of great weight; he was never ſo moved when they all forſook him, and *Peter* did forſwear him, as when they denyed Infants to come to him.

I could wiſh that theſe which with ſo much contempt and ſcurrilous language forbid Infants to be baptized, might read this place with obſervant ſpirits, and at leaſt grow more ſober and leſs violent in their expeſſions concerning poor Infants; doubtleſs it's a warning to all Chriſts Diſciples.

Now the reaſon which Jeſus Chriſt gives, is, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*: The reaſon ſhews what the priviledge was they would exclude Infants from, *viz.* being viſibly judged to belong to the Kingdom of God; and Chriſt ſaith, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Now take the Kingdom of God either

either for Heaven and Glory; or ſecondly, by way of alluſion, for the Church, and the ſtate of the Goſpel, it will ſerve as a full reaſon: Of ſuch, that is, of Infants, is Gods Kingdom made up, as well as of grown men, and they are as fit ſubjects as you are: But doubtleſs he eſpecially means by *the Kingdom of God*, as well the Kingdom of Grace in a viſible Church, as the Kingdom of Glory; becauſe elſe this could be no reaſon to convince the Diſciples of their errour, for they were againſt the viſible bringing Infants to Chriſt for to get ſome outward ſign of favour to them; and Chriſt tels them, they may be as well brought to Chriſt, and receive a viſible ſign, as grown perſons; for the Kingdom of God is made of ſuch, as of others.

1. Chriſt ſhews their intereſt in one of the higheſt priviledges, *The Kingdom of God*, and that viſibly.

2. He ſpeaks it *de præſenti*; not onely reſpecting their future eſtate, what they may be; but that even now the Kingdom of God is of ſuch.

3. He uſeth this as a common inſtructive principle for the future, never to forbid not onely theſe, but ſuch like Infants to be brought to him: For τοιούτων, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, Chriſt would have them take it as a conſtant principle, That wherever they found ſuch like Infants, they ſhould not reject them, but look on them with Goſpel reſpect.

Obj. Theſe that differ have nothing to ſay to this, but, That Chriſt means it of ſuch as children for humility,

mility, and meekneſs, and lowlineſs; and therefore in the following verſe he ſaith, *He that ſhall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little Child, ſhall not enter therein.*

Sol. It's true, Chriſt takes an occaſion to exhort them to humility and meekneſs, from the pattern of theſe little ones. But,

1. Chriſt ſhews Infants right to the Kingdom of God, as well as the Diſciples, and grown perſons, who can profeſs their own faith.

2. If Chriſt had meant only to make an example and reſemblance, he might have taken Sheep, and Doves more properly; for they are more meek and gentle then Children, who are commonly froward and peeviſh.

3. This croſſeth the end of Chriſts reaſon, which was, That Infants ſhould not be hindred from being brought to Chriſt, *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Now if he had meant of ſuch as were onely like them in ſome qualities, not of themſelves, there was nothing at all in Chriſts reaſon: And thus muſt the words be rendred on that account; *Suffer Infants to come to me, and do not forbid them; for not of them, but of humble perſons that reſemble them, is the Kingdom of God.* Men will rather make Chriſt ſpeak nonſenſe, then loſe their opinions.

4. Can we think Chriſt could be ſo diſpleaſed with his Diſciples for hindring little ones to be brought to him, meerly to ſhew them as reſemblances and patterns to grown men; and add this reaſon, *For*

of

of ſuch is
more fit
ſible Cre
ſuch Infa
would ha
to be eſt
Kingdon
Laſtly
theſe Inf
example
on them,
ſignal lo
conſidere
1. He
αὐτὰ; t
fections
Piſcator
Chriſt to
as Monu
Diſciple
character
Church
a natural
themſelv
he bore
ſeſſing D
his Chur
wholly
God:
he leaves

of such is the Kingdom of God, when he had examples more fit to that purpose, even among the meer sensible Creatures? No, Christ shews the priviledge of such Infants; and checks his Disciples pride, who would have none but themselves and grown persons to be esteemed as having any visible interest in the Kingdom of God.

Lastly, Let us view Christs carriage and actions to these Infants; he did not onely shew them as examples, but *took them up in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them*: all expressions of the most signal love, and favour, and of great import, if duly considered.

1. He took them up in his arms, ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ; the word signifies to embrace with special affections; so the French Translation *Embrasser Piscator embrachiare, amplexabunde gesto*, Bud. Christ took them up in his arms, and held them forth as Monuments of his love; and doubtless to shew his Disciples, that he would have some outward sign and character of peculiar respect set on them by his Church and Saints: Such a carriage was not out of a natural affection only to these that could not pity themselves, but from a heavenly strain of love which he bore to these little ones, as to the highest professing Disciple; and must needs be symbolical to his Churches, to take heed how they reject them wholly from any visible right to the Kingdom of God: Christ was to leave the world shortly, but he leaves it as a rule to his Disciples.

2. Christ

2. Christ layes his hands on them; which was used among the Jews as a form of special blessing, and in the N.T. for eminent ends.

1. For to cure all sorts of diseases by a miraculous power, *Luk.* 4.40.

2. For consecration of any to a Divine work and service; thus Church-Officers were solemnly separated to Christs work, as peculiarly fit for it, *Acts* 6.6. *Acts* 13.3. 1 *Tim.* 4 15. and 5.22. 2 *Tim.* 1.6.

3. It was used for confirmation after Baptism, and as an outward way whereby the holy Ghost was conveyed; and this is the most common use of it in the Acts of the Apostles, *Acts* 8. 17, 18, 19. and 19. 6. where those that were baptized had the Apostles hands laid on them, and they received the holy Ghost: And to this purpose may we apply Christs act to these Infants, to confirm the promise solemnly after Baptism. For,

1. It was ever used (except to sick persons) after Baptism.

2. As it presupposeth Baptism to precede, so it's an outward sign of a special significancy, and holds forth as much as if Christ had baptized them; for in that outward rite the holy Ghost was conveyed; and by laying on of hands others received the holy Ghost, as the former Scriptures express; and why not in this act of Christ on them? Take all the circumstances together, and you cannot imagine it to be a complemental act: And if this were as an outward sign of their receiving the holy Ghost, *What*

should

should hinder Water that Infants should not be baptized, seeing they have received the holy Ghost as well as we? Acts 10.47. Christ laid his hands on them, *Benedictas scilicet manus in quas à Patre suo acceperat omnia bona Cœli & Terræ*, saith a learned Divine on this place; *He laid those blessed hands on them, in which he had received from the Father all good things in Heaven and Earth.* This act shews,

1. That Christ would have some outward visible sign of favour set on such Infants by Churches: And Imposition of Hands being one of the choyseſt, Christ useth that as most proper to shew his Authority.

2. That holds forth, That if they be capable of imposition of hands, they are of an Ordinance of like nature, which especially looks at a subject purely passive.

Obj. If it be Objected, Why did not Christ baptize them as well as lay his hands on them, if he meant to hint out their right to Baptism?

Sol. It's easily answered, That Christ baptized none at all; but he did that which was an Ordinance usually in those Primitive times administred after Baptism, and equal to it, as to its dignity; and so far above Baptism, as it was more extraordinary in its practice: And so we may argue from this to Baptism, either inclusively, or *à majori*, from the greater; and I have more from this place to confirm me, that if Christ baptized any, he would these Infants; seeing he shews so much respect to them, more then to any

grown

grown perſon; and did to them thoſe acts which were equivalent, if not ſupereminent to them, then any can have againſt it. Let any that differ from us, ſhew anywhere in the Goſpel where Chriſt laid his hands on any but deſperate diſeaſed perſons to ſhew his power, or on Infants to ſhew his love, and confirm their antient priviledges, or upon any perſon in this latter ſenſe unbaptized.

Obj. 2. If it be ſaid, This was an extraordinary act of Chriſt, and no ordinary pattern may be drawn from it.

Sol. I anſwer; Grant it to be extraordinary, yet it argues more ſtrongly, if Chriſt uſed an extraordinary act to ſhew his affection and love to Infants, much more may the Church ſhew ordinary acts to them.

2. Chriſt ſhewed this extraordinary carriage, the more to check and convince his Diſciples for their extraordinary contempt of poor Infants, who would not allow them an ordinary intereſt in viſible priviledges. And it's conſiderable, that Impoſition of Hands was not an uſual Ordinance, or adminiſtred by any but Chriſt, before the aſcenſion of Chriſt, and the ſending of the holy Ghoſt.

3. Though Chriſts act ſhould be extraordinary, in regard of the imitation of that act by us; yet he grounds it on an ordinary rule and principle; *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; which he lays down as a fundamental rule. And this is the leaſt that can be gathered from it; That if Chriſt on this ground ſet

an

an extraordinary ſign on Infants, becauſe the Kingdom of God did viſibly belong to them; we may on the ſame principle ſet an ordinary initiating ſign on them, as viſible members of that glorious ſtate, as well as on grown viſible Profeſſors, who are but probable members, according to the moſt judicious charity; eſpecially if we will think Chriſts judgement in ſuch caſes equal with our own.

But leſt all this ſhould be thought but a meer outward act of Chriſts, that carried nothing of any inward deſign of grace, he bleſſed them after all, as the fulleſt expreſſion of his heart; and to demonſtrate, that whatever grace he had ſhould be theirs as others; for ſo the word, εὐλόγει αὐτὰ, ſignifies, either to ſpeak well of, or to any concerning perſons or things; and thus Chriſt may be thought to ſpeak much of the ſtate and priviledges of theſe Infants; or elſe to bleſs them, by deſiring for them, or communicating to them all ſorts of mercies, as bleſſings; according to that *Eph.* 1.3. And what can be more then for Chriſt to take up Infants in his arms, lay his hands on them, as an outward ſign, to conſecrate them to himſelf, and to ſhew their capacity of receiving the holy Ghoſt, and then to bleſs them; which comprehends the communication of all graces, and good things? And yet we muſt with ſcorn (poor probable Diſciples our ſelves) deny them a little water; and think it too much to have them named among the loweſt ſort of viſible Saints, when Chriſt owns them publickly, and ſaith, that *of ſuch as*

theſe

these is the Kingdom of God; and they may have more Interest in that Kingdom, then these that exclude them: but I shall rather believe Christs testimony, then any mans froward opinion: It's only a wonder how Saints, that have felt Christs bowels themselves, and read this Text, can be so rigid to Infants of Believers, to whom Christ hath been so kinde, and exemplary in his carriages; and stampt such visible characters of his love on, even in administration of outward signs. To what end should Christ do all this in such a high and peremptory strain of affection, if it were not to teach us charity and respect to Infants, in these ordinary administrations they are capable of; and to confirm their old state in the Church, by such a new and unwonted carriage; Christ abounding to them who were most undervalued, and could say nothing for themselves? And how harsh is it to conceive, that Christs intent was hereafter to cast them out of the visible Church, and from the participation of all outward signs of salvation, when his carriage was thus transcendently loving to them; and so only to give them a lightning before death? Let mens consciences, not gulph'd in prejudice, judge: This Text, if there were no more, will fly in the Consciences one day of the most confident Contemners of Infants, and their Baptism.

I shall only add, to satisfie the learned, the consent of godly and eminent Authors on this Scripture.

Non

Non eſt ulla hiſtoria in toto codice Evangelico, quæ frequentius in Templo legatur, quam hæc ipſa. Quoties enim Infans ad ſacrum baptiſmatis fontem affertur, toties etiam ex agendis Eccleſiaſticis hæc hiſtoria recitatur; ſed admodum rarò eadem in Eccleſia recitatur. Chemnitius & Polycarpus, Lyſerus in Harm. Evangel.

And doubtleſs it's no ordinary note, that three of the Evangeliſts ſhould ſo punctually relate this ſtory, without any conſiderable change of words or ſenſe. All the Objection is, becauſe the word *Baptiſm* is not inſerted, when as much as that comes to is; and that Chriſt baptized no grown perſons.

Hinc jam illud eſt quod dixiſſe Dominum omnes tres memorant, talium enim eſt regnum Cœlorum. Non ſanè adultorum tantum, qui ut Infantes ſeſe humiliarunt, quod Anabaptiſtæ contendunt. Hoc enim ſenſu, quod dixerat ſibi Infantes apportandos eſſe, tanquam ſubjecta, ratio minimè cohæreret, &c. Faceſſat igitur ſtulta iſta veſtra ſapientia; Sinite Infantes mihi adduci, aio enim non ſolum horum eſſe Regnum Cœlorum: ſed nullum omnino Regni hujus fore participem, niſi Infantibus his ſimilis evadat.

Si jam ad Eccleſiam pertinent, & ipſorum eſt Regnum Cœlorum: cur eis ſignum Baptiſmi, quo in Eccleſiam Chriſti, qui ad eam pertinent, recipi ſolent, negaremus? Siqui hœdi inter eos ſunt, tum excludendi nobis erunt, cum id eſſe ſeſe prodiderunt; interea ne

ſimus ſeveriores Chriſto —— aut eſt noſtrum baptizare pluſquam Domini amplecti, imponere manus & benedicere fuit? quæ fidei aut charitatis jactura per Baptiſmum Chriſto adducere quos adduci ſibi juſſit?

Much more then this hath *Bucer* on *Mat.* 19. 13, 14, 15. full of ſpiritual conſideration.

To this doth *Muſculus*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, add their holy teſtimonies: But I ſpare theſe quotations, becauſe it's *ad homines*, to men like our ſelves: Let theſe which diſſent read impartially, and conſider if this place ſhould ſtand alone, without any harmony of other Scriptures, whether there be not more in it for Infant-baptiſm, then any thing they have againſt it: I would be ſo ingenuous with them, as to deal with any of their awaked Conſciences.

Chap. XI.

Wherein is conſidered the method of God in the Old Teſtament, of adminiſtring Ordinances in Families, and baptizing Houſholds in the New-Teſtament; and how far it contributes to Infant-baptiſm.

IT'S not a ſlight thing to conſider, how that ever ſince the Fall this hath been an uſual method of God in adminiſtration of the Covenant, and priviledges of grace, to make it run through families and houſholds of Believers, as the ſpecial veins; Hence families, as they were the firſt natural ſocieties, ſo they were the firſt Churches; the Covenant and the priviledges of it was among them; from *Adam* to *Abraham* it went on thus: And when the Covenant in *Abrahams* time came to be more expreſly opened, and fairer expounded, God goes on ſtill in the ſame method, makes the Covenant with *Abraham* and his houſhold; only the family was enlarged, it became a greater houſhold, according to the vaſtneſs of the extent of the Covenant; yet ſtill it was diſpenſed as to a family. Now if you come to the New Teſtament, there you ſee God going on in the ſame method, as if he had caſt by an

eternal decree this platform: Baptiſm, the New Teſtament Ordinance, is adminiſtred according to the ſame deſign to families and houſholds. Let us conſider what Chriſt himſelf ſaith to *Zacheus*, *Luke* 19. who was a Gentile, and one of the chief Publicans; upon occaſion of this mans converſion, to open the nature and continuance of the Covenant to the Gentiles in the ſame form as it was to *Abraham*; *This day is ſalvation come to they houſe, foraſmuch as he alſo is a ſon of* Abraham: Here is the ſame language uſed in adminiſtration of Circumciſion in the Old Teſtament; and the ſame reaſon, *foraſmuch as he alſo* (καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν) *is a ſon of* Abraham: What can be drawn from this place more proper then theſe concluſions?

1. That as ſoon as ever he was converted and believed, Chriſt applies the promiſe to his houſe; if there were not ſomething more in it, he would have only ſaid, *Salvation is come to thee.*

2. It's clear that he opens the Covenant made with *Abraham*; not only to himſelf, but his houſe; and argues from his being a ſon of *Abraham*, that therefore the Covenant is not only made with him but with his houſe, that is, his ſeed: it were enough for to call him the ſon of *Abraham*, and to ſay, Salvation is come to himſelf: but to mention his houſe together with himſelf, and give this as a reaſon, becauſe he is the ſon of *Abraham*, is as much as to ſay, the priviledges of the Covenant is the ſame to you and your houſe, as it was to *Iſaac* and *Iacob foraſmuch*

as he alſo is a ſon of Abraham, *as well as they*. Now for Chriſt to ſpeak in this dialect, and to tell them of their houſholds, and of favour to them in the beginning of the Goſpel, and yet at the ſame time exclude their Infants from all outward ſigns of the promiſe, which they ever had in the darkeſt days of grace, is ſtrange policy, unſutable to the ſimplicity of Jeſus Chriſt.

Concerning this continued method of God, though this *Zacheus* be a ſingular, yet he is not the only example, if you read all along the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; theſe which had houſholds, the promiſe runs with a gracious entail. *Acts* 11. 14. *Cornelius* hath the promiſe to him and his houſe. *Acts* 16. 15. *Lydia* was baptized, and her houſhold. Ver. 31. the Apoſtle exhorts the Jaylor to believe, and he ſhould be ſaved, and his whole houſe; Iuſt as God made the Covenant with *Abraham*, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. 1, 2, 7. *And I will be a God to thee, and thy ſeed*, or houſhold. In ver. 33. its ſaid, he was baptized, and all his (αὐτος καὶ οἱ αὐτῦ) *he and all that were of him*; a moſt emphatical expreſſion to ſet forth his Children, who are the natural off-ſpring, and who are properly a mans own; he changes the general phraſe of a houſe, which may ſometimes comprehend more, aed comes more cloſe home; when he ſaith, he was baptized, he ſaith, all his (αὐτῦ) of him, which cannot be meant of ſervants, who are our own as goods and lands are, but not *of a man*: but muſt firſtly and primarily refer to his Children,

who are begotten of him; and it may be ſecondarily to his kindred; in the ſame phraſe you have it tranſlated, *Rom.* 16. 10, 11. *The Houſhold of* Ariſtobulus *the houſhold of* Narciſſus: but it is, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου, & τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου; *Theſe of* Ariſtobulus *and* Narciſſus: which muſt eſpecially be meant of their Children, and theſe that deſcended from their loyns.

The only Objection is from the following v. 34. where it is ſaid, *That the Jaylor believed with all his houſe*; and ſo none were baptized but Believers.

To which I anſwer, That is not a reſtriction or exception of all that were baptized, but a deſcription of the power the Word had upon all his houſe with himſelf; for he ſaid in the former verſe, that he was baptized, and with his thoſe which were begotten of him; and in this verſe he ſhews the actual influence of the Word on all his houſe likewiſe: So that the words are an after deſcription of the mighty workings of the Goſpel, not only to himſelf, who was baptized, and ſo his; but on all his houſe beſides.

2. Others, and men of good account, do relate πανόικει, *With all his houſe*, to the Jaylors rejoycing, not to his believing; and ſo read it thus, *And when he had brought them into his houſe, he ſet meat before them, and rejoyced, believing God, with all his houſe.* And it may be as well referred to the one as to the other.

However it's very obſervable, That when he ſpeaks of

the Apoſ
his houſe
the Word
to all that
baptizing
dren were
his, were
believed,
is no do
alſo.

But
as is by
Jaylors
example
baptizing
Goſpel.

1. It
that in a
little Ch

2. T
grounds
there we
not.

3. Eſ
guages in
of the ho
often in
3. 15. *P*

4. W
fants are

the Apoſtles preaching, and their believing, he names his houſe in the largeſt term ; v. 32. *They preached the Word to him, and all that were* (ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ) *to all that were in his houſe* : But when he ſpeaks of baptizing, he ſaith (that you may be ſure his Children were baptized) *that he, and all of him, or all his, were baptized.* Now he doth not ſay, *all that believed, but all* his *were baptized* : though there is no doubt but all that believed were baptized alſo.

But if there were no ſuch emphatical expreſſion, as is by the holy Ghoſt in the baptizing of the Jaylors houſe ; yet there is enough to make forth an example of Infant-baptiſm from the very notion of baptizing whole houſholds, ſo frequent in the Goſpel.

1. It will be very ſtrange confidence to affirm, that in all theſe houſes there were no Infants, or little Children.

2. There is greater probability, and ſtronger grounds to believe, when he names houſholds, that there were little ones in them, then that there were not.

3. Eſpecially when the word, *houſe*, in all languages in the world is moſt uſually put for Children of the houſe, who maintain and keep it up : and ſo often in Scripture, *Gen.* 30. 30. and 45. 18, 19. *N.* 3. 15. *Pſal.* 115. 12, 13. 1 *Tim.* 5. 8.

4. Where whole houſes are baptized, there Infants are not excluded, if they be in the houſe ; and

if not excluded, they are included; they cannot be excluded, for they are principal parts of the houſe; and if only *adulti*, or grown perſons ſhould be meant, when Children are named, that would be to exclude Infants from being Children, as well as from being parts of the houſhold.

When *Abraham* and his houſe were circumciſed, *Abrahams* Children were the principal parts of the houſe; and they were firſt circumciſed, and then his ſervants, and all in his houſhold were circumciſed alſo, being Profeſſors of the ſame faith; for *Abraham* had a godly family: Yet upon a different account; the one by vertue of *Abrahams* Covenant, which was made primarily with him and his Children, with all his family likewiſe, as they profeſt *Abrahams* faith, and ſerved *Abrahams* God; and ſo it may be eaſily conceived how whole houſholds were baptized in the New Teſtament, the Children as in the Fathers Covenant; the Servants and others by vertue of the ſame profeſſion: And in this ſenſe there will be no ambiguity in the phraſe of baptizing whole houſholds.

Laſtly, That the Apoſtle ſhould borrow an expreſſion always uſed in the Old Teſtament to include Children eſpecially, and make uſe of it in the New to exclude them, would be ſtrange but to conjecture: Now when ever the houſhold is ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament, it always includes Children. This is ſtill more for the baptizing of Infants, then any thing they can ſay againſt it; and compared with all the

former

former Scriptures, may make up a full demonstration to a judicious conscience.

Chap. XII.

Circumcision and Baptism compared; that they have both one spiritual signification; the true nature of them both opened, and what influence this consideration hath to prove Infant-baptism.

It's well known among these that are against baptizing of Infants, what weight they put on that Ordinance of Baptism, that all other seem light in their eyes, and of no account in respect of that. When they speak of Circumcision, they usually call that a carnal Ordinance, sealing only carnal and temporary things, and only reaching the outward man; the one requiring only the flesh for its subject, the other a spiritual man, a new creature, &c. And so much do they idolize (for so I fear it is among many) Baptism, that even faith it self seems little without it: But that I may wash off this paint, and make Ordinances look like themselves, let us compare these Ordinances together, and view them in their dignity, and worth, and significations. And,

1. In

1. In general for Circumcision; We all know how much it was prized among the Iews above all other Ordinances, and that it was the last that was taken away with the greatest difficulty; about which the Apostles had more ado, then about the taking away all the Ceremonies; whereby we may judge, the Iews did look on it as the great seal of all their priviledges; which when that was lost, all was lost. Read the Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. 2.3. when he would speak all their outward priviledges at once, he saith, *What advantage hath a Jew? what profit of Circumcision, &c?* So in the *Galatians*, *Philippians*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, many Chapters are spent to take them off from Circumcision.

2. Circumcision was that Ordinance which was immediately annexed to the Covenant, and a confirmation of it, *Gen.*17.7,10. therefore called the Covenant.

3. It was an Ordinance instituted long before the Legal and Mosaical Ceremonies of an elder date: It was not a type of *Canaan*, but of Christ to come in the flesh of the seed of *Abraham*, and of the circumcision of the heart, which Christ was most fully to perfect in the Gospel.

There is only one Gentleman that writ a Book of Baptism, printed in the year 1646. will have Circumcision to be a type of Baptism, which cannot be: For,

1. Types must have something in their outward face to represent another thing more eminent and real:

real : Now Circumciſion hath nothing in the outſide to ſet forth Baptiſm.

2. It is not ſo handſom to make one outward ſign the antitype of another.

4. Circumciſion was as holy an Ordinance as Baptiſm in the New Teſtament; for they are both in themſelves outward acts, and no holineſs more in one then in another, but as they have from inſtitution: only Baptiſm is more eaſie to the fleſh then Circumciſion; and yet not more eaſie, if that way of dipping ſhould be the only way of baptizing, eſpecially at ſome ſeaſons, and to ſome bodies.

5. The N. T. gives as large and honourable characters of Circumciſion, as it doth of Baptiſm: thus the Apoſtle cals it in *Rom.*4 *The ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*: A character ſo reſplendent and glorious, that the Goſpel can give no higher to an Ordinance. And as much as he ſaith of Baptiſm in effect. 1 *Pet.* 3.21. that baptiſm ſaves through the anſwer of a good conſcience, the contrary Opinioniſts are put to hard ſhifts to avoyd the ſtrength of this place; and therefore ſome would evade it thus, ſaying, That the Apoſtle doth not call it a ſeal of the Covenant or Promiſe, but of the righteouſneſs of faith.

Sol. A miſerable evaſion! as if the righteouſneſs of faith were not included in the Covenant, or there were any righteouſneſs of faith but what comes by the Covenant, and ſo would make a ſeparation between the promiſe of righteouſneſs, and the righteouſneſs promiſed. Others

Others would cloath the Text with this diſguize, That it ſealed it only to *Abraham*, whereas it was ſo to *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and *David*, and all that were in the Covenant.

This is held forth moſt clearly in that verſe.

1. That Circumciſion was a ſeal of the pure Covenant of grace, in which righteouſneſs was promiſed to *Abraham* and his ſeed indefinitely.

2. That this ſeal was applied to all the ſeed that were but externally and viſibly in Covenant, to Infants; and the ſame ſign that *Abraham* received upon profeſſion of his faith, his Child received; and therefore he is ſaid to be the Father of Circumciſion, as of Faith; ver. 12.

3. Doctor *Willet* from this place holds forth the ſameneſs of the ſubſtance of the Sacraments of the Old and New Teſtament, both which do ſeal the righteouſneſs of faith; and lays it as a great errour on the Romaniſts, who affirm, That the Old Teſtament Sacraments did not exhibite the graces of the New.

4. This cannot be denied from the place, without men will wilfully put out their own eyes, that Circumciſion had as glorious a uſe as Baptiſm, *viz.* to ſeal the righteouſneſs of faith; which muſt be as well to others that had the true efficacy of the Covenant, as to *Abraham* himſelf; and no higher mercy can any Ordinance of the New Teſtament ſeal to any.

There were many other circumſtantial and accidental

dental uſes of circumciſion according to the Jewiſh ſtate, as we will grant Mr. *Tombes*, as,

1. To engage to the performance of the whole Law, *Gal.* 5. 2, 3. *Acts* 15. 10.

2. To be a partition-wall between Jew and Gentile, *Eph.* 2. 14.

But when the Apoſtle would give circumciſion his true character, and ſhew what the primary, and ſubſtantial uſe of it was, he calls it a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith.

6. Circumciſion and baptiſm ſignifie one and the ſame thing, and ſo agree in being ſigns of the ſame grace; compare *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12, 13. with *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. and 6. v. circumciſion ſignifies the putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh; baptiſm is into Chriſts death, and to teſtifie the crucifying the old man with him, that the body of death might be deſtroyed, as by the comparing theſe two places it is moſt clear, and 3. v. and 6. ver. of *Rom.* 6. chap. onely baptiſm hath this larger conſideration in it, as that it takes in Chriſts reſurrection with it, and alſo the quickning of the ſoul together with him, which was not ſo fully ſignified in Circumciſion, but implied, according as the Apoſtle argues in the ſame place, *Rom.* 6. 5. v. for if we have been planted in the likeneſs of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſs of his reſurrection; the one being a conſequence of the other; and as circumciſion did cut off the foreskin in token of the deſtruction of ſin, ſo baptiſm by waſhing, ſignifies the taking away the pollution of ſin; thus God when he would

would promiſe to kill ſin, and work all grace, he expreſſeth it by circumciſion; *I will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed.* Deut. 30.6. And the Apoſtle *Phil.* 3. 4. ſaith, *We are of the circumciſion*, that is, we have the true work of grace in us.

The reaſon why I urge theſe conſiderations, is to hold for the capacity of Infants, as well for baptiſm as circumciſion; there is no reaſon why they ſhould be thought more unfit and incapable for the one then for the other: For,

Firſt, if Circumciſion were a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, and yet applied to Infants, and baptiſm can ſeal no higher mercy, why ſhould it be thought ſuch a ſtrange and unmeet thing to baptize them, more then to circumciſe them? they uſually ſay you put a ſeal to a blank in baptizing Infants; the ſame might be ſaid as to Circumciſion; yet they were circumciſed as well as *Abraham* that profeſt his own Faith. I muſt acknowledge I never could yet underſtand why Infants ſhould be thought fit to have that ſeal applied to them in the Old Teſtament, which the New calls a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, and yet be denied it in the New Teſtament as incapacious, when Baptiſm can ſeal no more. I wiſh it were ſeriouſly conſidered;

Eſpecially, Secondly, when Baptiſm ſhall ſignifie the ſame thing in ſubſtance, be both ſigns of the ſame grace; the one cutting away ſin as with a knife, the other waſhing it away with water; and yet Infants capable, and moſt fit to have the adminiſtration of the

one

one ordinance, not of the other; if theſe of the diſſenting judgment, did with more ſobriety weigh ſuch conſiderations as theſe, they would not with ſo much fooliſh contempt write and ſpeak of Infants Baptiſm.

A knife may be applied to an Infant, as to *Abraham*, though old, and in the heigth of his Faith, and ſeal the righteouſneſs of it; but water muſt onely be poured on actual believers, and grown perſons, ſuch as *Abraham*, but not on Infants, though it hath no more to ſeal; as if there were ſome ſtrange excellency and vertue in the nature of water, that it were too precious to waſh the Infants of believers: For, if there be no more vertue in the water that baptizeth, then in the knife that circumciſed, you ſee there is no more glorious uſe of the one then the other. And what end God ſhould have to put ſuch a Seal on Infants in the Old Teſtament, and exclude them in the New, when the Ordinances both ſignifie the ſame ſubſtantial grace, let any Chriſtian heart imagine.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That famous place, Colos. 2. 11, 12. *opened: the correspondence between Circumcision and Baptism further cleared.*

THE scope of the Apostle in the former verses is to dissuade the Christians from Jewish ceremonies, especially from Circumcision; and he doth it especially from the discovery of Christs fulness, and our being compleat in him; that is, you need nothing out of Christ now; but they object we want Circumcision; he tells them they are circumcised in him, 11 v. where the Apostle distinguisheth of a twofold circumcision, one χειροποιητος, made with hands, the other αχειροποιητος, made without hands, which he calls the Circumcision of Christ, but it is wrought by him, and is by union with him; and you being circumcised in Christ, and have the grace signified by outward Circumcision, you need no more; but there be two things they might object:

First, that this is nothing to the question: you would take us off from outward Circumcision, by telling us we are inwardly circumcised, whereas the sign and the thing signified should always go together: *Abraham* had this Circumcision and others, and yet were outwardly circumcised.

Secondly, they might object we are not so compleat

pleat in Christ as *Abraham* and his seed; for, besides the inward grace, they had an outward sign and Seal to confirm it to them.

The Apostle in the 12 verse answers both at once, they were not onely circumcised inwardly, with Christs Circumcision, but there was an outward sign in the New Testament to be applied to them, of the same consideration; Buried with him in Baptism,&c. This is the summe of the words, let us now consider what may be fairly deducted from them.

Many, and the most of our Divines, do conclude from hence the succession of Baptism in the place or room of Circumcision, that this Ordinance is appointed in the New Testament in lieu of the former, and for the same ends and purposes; which doubtless is true from this place, if men would truly weigh the import of the words, and not fight with their own shadows.

First, this compleatness in Christ is as well to enjoyment of Ordinances, and outward priviledges, as inward graces; else he would never have mentioned Baptism outwardly, when in the former verse he speaks of inward Circumcision; he would have kept still in that strain.

Secondly, observe how he joins them together, and makes them one, the inward circumcision confirmed by the outward baptism, circumcised with the Circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism; now this could not be proper, nor of any possible connexion, but by putting the outward sign of ba-

Ptiſm inſtead of the outward ſign of Circumciſion; that is, you are circumciſed becauſe baptized; you change but the outward element, or inſtrument; but the ſame inward grace is confirmed by both; thus the words are legible, and to be underſtood, without difficultie; but any other interpretation will be found moſt rugged, and unſuitable: For,

Thirdly, as the Apoſtle could not ſay in the former v. that they were circumciſed in Chriſt, but from the analogie between the outward ſign, and the inward grace; that is, if the outward ſign of Circumciſion had not ſignified ſuch an inward work; ſo neither could he have found they were circumciſed in Chriſt, being buried with him in baptiſm, if that Ordinance of baptiſm did not as an outward ſign anſwer to that inward Circumciſion, and were inſtead of that ſign which did directly repreſent it formerly.

Fourthly, the nature of the Apoſtles deſign holds out this; for he would take them off the practiſe of Circumciſion; and this he doth by diſcovering of another Ordinance, more ſuitable to the Goſpel, which ſhould ſignifie the ſame thing unto them, in a more large and emphaticall manner, ſignifying not onely Chriſts death, but his reſurrection; ſo that in the very import of the phraſe he cals baptiſm a Goſpel circumciſion; and this argument he uſeth as moſt effectual to take them off Circumciſion, by ſhewing them they were compleat in Chriſt in the New Teſtament, as to inward graces, and outward

outward Ordinances, for though they were not circumcised, they had baptism to supplie the want of it with advantage, so that they should not lose an Ordinance, but exchange. *In whom you are circumcised, &c. buried with him in baptism*; if baptism did not seal and confirm the inward Circumcision, it could not be said *circumcised in Christ, being buried with him in baptism*, and baptism could not seal inward Circumcision, but as it was of the same use with outward Circumcision, which did most directly signifie the circumcision of the heart; and baptism held the same analogie, and was instituted to the same end; therefore it's called the washing of regeneration. Suppose the Ordinance should again be changed, and the inversion should be thus, That baptism should be abolished, and circumcision set up again, and the Apostle should express himself after the same manner; intending to take them off the use of baptism, and to be circumcised; and say ye are compleat in Christ, in whom ye are also baptized with the baptism of Christ, being circumcised with him; would not the deduction be clear, that circumcision was ordained instead of baptism, and to supply the defect of that Ordinance? the same conclusion must be according to the words as from circumcision to baptism.

The summe of all is, That as inward circumcision was signified by the outward circumcision the circumcision made without hands, by the circumcision with hands, as the proper and direct sign of it; so is that inward circumcision, as really and fully signified,

and confirmed by baptiſm; and that Ordinance is appointed to repreſent and ſeal that, as the outward act of circumciſion was formerly: ſo that circumciſion and baptiſm, as to the thing ſignified, and the inward intent of their uſe, are made all one: elſe it will be very hard to make ſenſe of this place of Scripture.

The Pleas againſt this interpretation are of little worth, if weighed; ſome ſay it's onely meant of the inward circumciſion, and inward baptiſm, which interpretation will ſerve us better then themſelves; for if inward graces, and of the ſame ſubſtantial work be done on us, as circumciſed and baptized in Chriſt, it ſhews the oneneſs of the outward ſigns in the ſame ſignification.

Mr. *Tombes* ſaith in his *Examen* p. 93. That there is an analogie between circumciſion and baptiſm: yet ſaith it is rather between circumciſion and Chriſts burial, then between circumciſion and baptiſm, as *Chryſoſtom*, and after him *Theophylact* on the place.

All which will ſtill make out the truth of our interpretation; For,

Firſt, if there be an analogie between them, as is, and muſt be granted, then there is ſome proportion and agreement between theſe two Ordinances; now it's not in the outward adminiſtration, nor the externall ſign, in that there is no proportion between a knife and water; and therefore it muſt be in their proper ſignification and reall uſe, which is the Apoſtles ſcope in this place: and therefore he expreſſeth the inward grace properly ſignified by the one Ordi-

nance,

nance, and yet confirmed by the other; *Circumciſed in him, being buried with him in Baptiſm.*

2. If the analogy be between Circumciſion and Chriſts burial, not between it and Baptiſm, yet it will come all to one, yea be our advantage: For,

1. That ſhews that Circumciſion did hold forth as much as Baptiſm, *viz.* Chriſts death and burial.

2. That when we are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, and that is the outward ſign to repreſent our burial with Chriſt, we are as if we were circumciſed; Circumciſion holds analogy with Chriſts burial, and ſo doth Baptiſm with both: And thus take it in what ſenſe you will, the Text will clear it ſelf.

Chap. XIV.

A clear Explication of Mat. 28. 19. *with* Mar. 16. 15, 16. *wherein their argument from the first institution is opened and confuted.*

LET us at length come to view that prime Text, *Matth.* 28. 19. on which these that are against Infant-baptism lay the most weight. As from the very first institution of that Ordinance, Christ gives his Apostles there Commission to teach and baptize; *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and holy Ghost.* Hence (μαθητεύσατε) which they translate, Disciple all Nations, and then baptize them, they argue, None are to be baptized by Christs institution, but these which are first taught, and so made Disciples: But Infants are not capable to be taught, or to be made Disciples. *Ergo*, They may not be baptized.

That I may shew the errors of this argument, and so fully clear up the point, the terms with their connexion both in the major and minor proposition must be examined from the words of the Text, and that parallel place, *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which for methods sake I shall hold forth in these following considerations.

1. For

1. For the word μαθητεύσατε, we ſhall not much ſtand on, whether it be tranſlated to make Diſciples, or as it is in our common verſion, *Go teach all Nations*; for it is ſometimes a verb tranſitive; to teach by writing, or *viva voce*, with a living voice; and ſo it is to be taken here, ſaith learned *Whitaker De Script.* and moſt agreeable with *Mar.* 16. 15. where he bids them *Go preach the Goſpel to every Creature.*

2. The ſtrength of the argument lies (if there be any ſtrength in it) on the abſolute ſuppoſed connexion between diſcipling and being baptized; therefore they ſay, None but theſe which are capable of teaching, are capable of Baptiſm; which is *Fallacia à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*, a Fallacy to take that abſolutely which is meant only according to ſome reſpect. But to ſhew the idleneſs of the connexion;

1. You find preaching or teaching the Goſpel to be ſeparated as to the adminiſtration, and neceſſary and immediate connexion, by *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel*; ſo he ſaith in the former verſes, *He taught many, baptized few.*

2. Compare this with *Mar.* 16. 15 16. which expounds this, you will find believing and being baptized as cloſe connected to ſalvation, as here Baptizing to Teach; *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Now if any will ſtand on the order of words to prove an inſtitution, we may as well argue from

from *Mark*, as they from *Matthew*; None muſt be baptized but theſe which are taught; ſo none that believeth, and is not baptized, can be ſaved; and that Baptiſm is as neceſſary to ſalvation as believing; for in order of phraſe they are abſolutely joyned together: And what a ſtrange inference would that be to make Baptiſm equal with faith to ſalvation? and yet we have as much ground to argue from the one place ſo, as they from the other; without they will admit ſome other qualifying term to make it up.

3. The order of things is not always, or commonly ſo exactly expreſt in Scripture by the poſition of the words; for ſometimes one thing in the order of words is put before another, which in order of nature and conſideration is antecedent to it; as *Mar.* 1. 15. Repentance is put before Faith, *Rom.* 10. 9. Confeſſion with the mouth is put before believing with the heart, as to ſalvation; with abundance of other places of Scripture. Thus many things in the Evangeliſts are left out by one, ſupplied by another; and the ſame word directly uttered in one, inverted in another; eſpecially about the adminiſtration of the Lords Supper. For to avoyd rediouſneſs, conſult the places your ſelves. *Mat.* 26. 26, 27. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23. *Luk* 22. 20. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25.

3. A third conſideration to open this Text in *Matthew*, is from comparing it once more with its parallel, *Mar.* 16. 15. there it is, *Go preach the Goſpel*; here it is, *Teach and baptize*: Now hence it follows, that

that their teaching was by holding forth the Goſpel: As much as if he had ſaid, Open the Covenant, tell men the riches and fulneſs of grace: Now if they muſt teach the Goſpel, they muſt needs inſtruct them in the Covenant, which was to theſe that believed, and their ſeed. Now ſutable to this Commiſſion, *Peter*, when he comes to open the Goſpel to the Jews pricked in their hearts, preſently holds out the promiſe to them and their Children, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. and by that to make them both Diſciples. So *Gal.* 3. 13. The bleſſings of *Abraham* to come on the Gentiles, is one of the main parts of the Goſpel. Now if they teach men Goſpel, they muſt preach as *Peter* did when he had converted the Parent, *The Promiſe is to you and to your Children.* Thus in *Luk.* 1. 72. this is made one great end of Chriſts coming, *to perform the mercy promiſed to our Fathers,, and to remember his holy Covenant*; ſo that preaching the Goſpel is preaching the Covenant. Now that Infants are in the Covenant as well as grown perſons, we have formerly proved.

4. This is no more then was required of *Abraham* at the time of Circumciſion, and yet his Infants were not excluded from the Ordinance. *Gen.* 17. *Walk before me, and be perfect. Chap.* 18. 19. *Abraham* was to command his Children, and teach them to keep the ways of the Lord: and yet his Children were not to be kept from the ſign of the Covenant, until they were taught, and had walked before God in uprightneſs, as *Abraham.*

5. To

5. To come home to the word, in their own ſenſe, μαθητεύσατε ſignifies *Make Diſciples*; now Children are not capable of being made Diſciples, ſay they.

I anſwer, 1. Some have been made Diſciples before they were diſtinctly taught, as the twelve, whom Chriſt called, and they followed him, and became his Diſciples, and were real Diſciples, yet as ignorant as Infants, and were taught afterwards by degrees.

2. One is ſaid to be made a Diſciple even in vulgar phraſe, as well who is liſted in the School to be taught, as one that is teaching or already taught, though he hath not learnt a letter: Thus in all Schools it's a uſual phraſe at the firſt entrance of a Child, he is called a new Scholar, or a new Diſciple; Thus Infants being entred into Chriſts School, and given up to be taught in time, and by degrees, may be accounted Diſciples; it was ſo in the former inſtance, and it's no ſtrange expreſſion in civil Schools.

3. Infants are expreſly called Diſciples in the New Teſtament, as well as grown and taught men: Thus *Acts* 15.10. Circumciſion is called a yoke put on the neck of the *Diſciples*, that is, on Infants, who were the ſpecial Subject of that Ordinance, and bore the burthen of it, and not properly the Parents; and yet the Parents had the deep ſenſe of it reflecting on themſelves and their little ones, and therefore he calls it a yoke that they nor their Fathers were able to bear; eſpecially becauſe it did bind them and their Children

to

to keep the whole Law; there is no evasion of this; if they say it was meant of the Fathers, and of the doctrine of Circumcision, which did bind themselves; yet they must grant the yoke was on their Children as to the act; and that if the doctrine was so burthensome, much more the practice, which the poor Infants are under; and they are called indifinitely *Disciples*, either by themselves, or with their Parents; And the argument is thus: Those were Disciples on whom the yoke of circumcision was laid; but on Infants was this yoke laid. *Ergo* Infants are Disciples in the New Testament expression. If you will make any distinction, it must be in the manner of laying on the yoke, *viz.* on the Parents doctrinally, on the Children actually: but there can be no restriction of the word, *Disciples*, from these on whom that yoke was laid, as is expresst in that Chapter. Consider,

4 Let us come to the subjects to whom the Gospel is to be preached; and they taught and baptized; it is in *Mathew*, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *all Nations*; *in Mark* it is, *Preach the Gospel*, πάσῃ κτίσει, *to every Creature*: Now that Infants should be none of all the Nations, and excluded from being of this creation of God, who were included as special subjects when the Church was in but so smal a spot of the world, is from our narrow apprehensions in the Gospel times of dispensation of Grace.

And the argument our Divines bring from this place is strong and most considerable: The Gospel is to be preached to every Creature, all Nations must be

be diſciples; but Infants are a part of this creation, are included in all Nations; therefore they muſt be made Diſciples alſo. Read the Text again; *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations* (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) *baptizing them* (αὐτοὺς) which muſt needs refer to (τὰ ἔθνη) though the one be maſculine, the other the neuter; or elſe muſt relate to nothing, for it hath no Relative beſides to anſwer unto: This is very common in Scripture, and the ſame phraſes, as thoſe well know that underſtand the Greek in *Rev.* 2. 26, 27. and *Chap.* 19. 15. there is ἔθνη with αὐτοὺς, as Mr. *Cobbet* of *N. E.* well obſerves. Conſult *Acts* 15. 17. and 26. 17. *Acts* 21. 25. *Eph.* 2. 11. Maſculines joyned with (ἔθνη) that ſignifies *all Nations*. Now are Infants none of the Nations, or none of the National creation which the Goſpel may reach? God forbid.

The words hold forth only the general commiſſion given to the Apoſtles after Chriſts death; which was an enlarging of their bounds, who were only formerly circumſcribed in *Judea*, and charged not to go into the way of the Gentiles: but now the empale is broken down, they muſt preach the Goſpel to every creature, teach all Nations, and baptize them: but it doth not hold forth either the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm, or the form or manner of baptizing, which ſhould not be delivered (according to their own rule of inſtitutions) in general and indefinite terms, as, *Every Creature, all Nations*; and by tranſitive words, as, *Preach the Goſpel to them, teach them.* If this be the prime inſtitution of baptizing, from

from which place they exclude Infants, when Christ useth such universal and comprehensive expressions; we shall desire but to deal with them on their ground, and the same Text will serve to prove our positions more demonstratively then theirs: And this Text shews, that Christ gave commission to the Apostles and Ministers to preach and baptize; but in what order to do it, or what should be required to the qualification of the subject as absolutely necessary, is not at all discovered in this Scripture; they must look for another Text to exclude Infants besides this, else give up their confidence.

Either this place is the full and exact rule of institution of baptizing, or not; if they say it is, then it would describe the persons, and the manner, the matter and the form of baptizing, and that in the usual phrase with other Scriptures: but here is only a general commission to two great acts, *viz.* to preach, teach and baptize; and we may say in the same place, that whoever are outwardly taught, or do but hear the Gospel (though they walk never so contrary) must be baptized; for the commission is, Teach and baptize, nothing of the parties entertainment of it is mentioned in this *Mat.* 28. nor of the qualification of the subject with any distinguishing character. If they say this doth not hold forth all the institutions in every particular, as they must grant, then we may compare other Scriptures with this, to make out the full institution, as these where

Infants

Infants are mentioned with ſo much gracious conſideration, as hath been formerly expreſt.

Chap. XV.

Concerning the ſignification and uſe of the word Baptiſm, *or to be baptized; the genuine Etymologie of it in the Old and New Teſtament; the places in the New Teſtament brought to prove it ſignifies to plunge the whole body, anſwered.*

THE confidence of theſe that differ hath been ſo great, that as they have excommunicated Infants from the capacity of ſuch a priviledge, which they had ſo old a title unto; ſo they have forced this only ſenſe from the word *to baptize*, that it muſt ſignifie to plunge the whole body under water; and deny that to be true Baptiſm, which is not ſo adminiſtred; and ſo make it as eſſential to the manner, as viſible profeſſion to the matter.

For clearing up of this miſt, I have diligently enquired into the propriety of the word, and its uſe in the Greek Tranſlators of the Old and New Teſtament,

ment, which are the beſt guides in this caſe; and if we look narrowly, it will be very hard to find, and very ſeldome, that ever the word in Scripture is uſed for the total immerſion of the body, or being abſolutely under water.

The word (βαπτίζειν) ſignifies among all Writers both Heathen and Eccleſiaſtical, promiſcuouſly to dip into, or waſh with water, by pouring on of it, or ſprinkling; and there is nothing more uſual in the New Teſtament expreſſion of it, then to hold forth any kind of waſhing; It's expreſt in Authors by *madefactare, lavare, abluere*, to wet or waſh: thus *Budæus*, *Scapula*, *Paſor* and *Grotius* do interpret the word, though they grant it is, and may be taken more ſtrictly for immerſion: but let the Scripture explain it ſelf, *Mar.* 7. 4. it is uſed for the waſhing of hands, and of cups, and beds, and brazen veſſels, and of tables; which is not by plunging them in the water, ſo much as waſhing them by the pouring forth of water on them; for ſo it is expreſt, when they came from the market they durſt not eat (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται) without they were baptized, that is, waſhed; which could not be their whole bodies, without both exceſſive trouble and danger, for which times and ſeaſons muſt be obſerved: And beſides this (ſaith the Evangeliſt) they retained many other things in cuſtome, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων, &c. as the Baptiſm of cups, that is, *lotiones*, or the waſhing of cups; which may be as well done by pouring on water, as by plunging into water, and ſo and is uſually done in

all

all Nations. So in *Luk.* 11. 38. the Phariſees wondred at Jeſus (ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου) that he was not baptized before dinner, that is, did not waſh. And *Heb.* 9. 10. all the Ceremonial waſhings or ſprinklings are called Baptiſms; in a metaphorical ſenſe it's uſed for the pouring forth of the ſpirit.

And further, when it is tranſlated to dip, both in the Old and New Teſtament, it ſignifies commonly the leaſt touch or taſt of any thing that is liquid. So *Luke* 16. 24. *Dives* begs that *Lazarus* might be ſent (ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος) that he might baptize, or dip the top of his finger in water to cool his tongue; the leaſt drop would have been prized by him, 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. *Jonathan* is ſaid to dip the end of his rod in an hony-comb, that is, but to take a very little; and the word is (ἐνέβαψεν) ſo it is uſed in *Exod.* 12. 22. *Joh.* 13. 26.

But to put it out of queſtion, that there needs no ſuch rigidneſs; and in preſsing this method of plunging, from the word *Baptiſm*, let us compare it with other phraſes. When the Scripture would expreſs a covering of the whole body under water, and ſo a ſubmerſion, or being wholly under water, it uſeth two other words, as different from baptizing, *viz.* καταποντίζειν, and δύειν and δύεσθαι. Compare 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. All the Fathers and the Iſraelites are ſaid to be baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea; they had only

Differt à δύειν, quod eſt profundum petere, & penitis ſubmergi. Paſor, Lexic.

only the dewings of the Cloud, and the sprinklings of the water on them as they past through: But in *Exod.* 15.4,5. when he speaks of *Pharoah* and his Hoast, he doth not say they were baptized in the waters, but useth these two words, κατεπόντισεν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, *they were drowned in the Red Sea, submersi*; and he, adds, *the depths have covered them*; and κατέδυσ᾽ εἰς βυθὸν, ὥσει λίθος, *they sank*, or as the word is, *doused themselves into the bottom as a stone, while the Israelites were but baptized under the gentle droppings of the Cloud, and of the Sea.* And the very same distinction did the Greek Writers make between baptizing and dousing, or casting under water; expressing by baptizing, to be in the water as a Bottle is, or Ship that is seldom or never wholly overwhelmed: And this appears most demonstratively to be their meaning by the verse of the Ancient Oracle of the *Athenians*, who well knew how to speak and distinguish Greek.

Ἀστλὸς βαπτίζῃ, δύναι δέ τοι οὐ θέμις ἐστι.

Baptize or Wash him, utris instar *as a Botttle in water, but do not drown him, or utterly plunge him.*

Whereby it plainly appears that the word (*to baptize*) signifies any kind of washing, whether by sprinkling or pouring out of water, or dipping into water; and that it is specially distinguished from these words that do signifie a total submersion; and these

men do rack the word only to speak for plunging under water, excluding the usual and more common sence of it, which is to wash or cleanse.

But let us view the Scriptures which they bring for the maintainance of this signification, *Mat.*3.13,16. *Jesus after he was baptized, went straight wayes up out of the water*, (ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος) which may be translated, *he went up from the waters*, ἀπὸ signifying more properly *ab* then *ex*, *from* then *out*; and it is most suitable to translate it so, because all rivers, for most part, lie low, and in valleys, in coming to which we are said to descend, and coming from to ascend: thus when Christ ascended, in *Act.*1.9. *He was taken out of their sight*, that is, from their sight.

Of the like consideration is that other place, which they lay so much weight on for to hold forth plunging, *Act* 8.36,37,38. Of *Philip* and the Eunuch, it is said they *went both down into the water* (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ) which may as well, and better be translated, *they went down to, or towards the water*; it seems they being on the upper ground, spied water below them, and so went down to it to be baptized, as it is a common phrase among us, to go down to the water side.

But secondly, should we grant them this interpretation, that *they went both down into the water*, which is a straining of the words, yet it can never be proved from this, that their whole body was dipt all over: a man may go into the water, and yet not be over his shoes; and how can they prove by this place they went in any further, or how far they went; or whether *Philip*

did not take up water, and poured it on him; or ether he duckt him under water, or dipt onely his d; nothing can be proved from this place; but if y conjecture one thing, we may another, with as ch evidence. In the 107. Psal. it is said, *They that down to the sea in ships, see thy wonders*; when they down into the sea in ships, is the ship plunged all ? or are they under water in the ship ?

Yet thirdly, it is evident that their going into the ter, is distinguished in the same ver. from the Eu- us being baptized; they went down, or to (or ording to their own mind) into the water, and he ptized him: so that the going into the water, take for dipping and ducking, is not baptizing, but some- ng distinct, another act; and if they will prove go- down to the water, or into the water, in this place otes the dipping of the whole body, then he must dipt before he was baptized; for *Philip* baptized after they went into the water.

Again, there is as much from this phrase to prove *lip* to be dipt as the Eunuch; and if dipping be tizing, for the text saith expresly, *they both went to*, or *in the water*, if you interpret it after their heart, that they both went into the water, *Phi-* was as much in the water as the Eunuch; for there no exception made, but both went in together, and should then baptize the Eunuch? if this seem be an absurdity to them, how can they from this ression, in the severest acception, conclude the uch was dipt? but they both went into the wa-

ter together, seeing the Text speaks as much of *Philips* going into the water, as of the Eunuchs: But if we take it according to the first translation, that they went both down towards the water, there may be some reasonable account given how the one was baptized; which seems to be most probable, by pouring out water upon him.

If any one object further from the next verse, that they ascended out of the water, here is not (ἀπὸ τοῦ in the former place, but ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος) *out of the water*; yet it will not at all help them; for it is said of them both, they came up out of the water, and it speaks as much of *Philips* dipping himself as the Eunuch; and you may as well argue that *Philip* was new dipt, and that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping, because they both came up out of the water; besides, one may be said very properly to come out of the water, that put but his foot into it; and thus you see on what weak foundations these high structures of confidence and rigidness are built.

The third and most triumphant place, which they cry up, and adore for this manner of baptizing by dipping, is *John* 3. 23. *And John was baptizing in Ænon near to Salem, because there was much water there.*

If we consider impartially, here is but a Geographical description of this place, of its situation, by *Salem*, and of the benefit they had of water, in regard of the most places besides in the countrey, as *Ænon* lying nigh the banks of *Jordan*; and whereas the

lay the weight on this, that he gives it as a reaſon why *Iohn* was baptizing at *Ænon*, becauſe there was much water there; it may be a very good reaſon why he choſe that place for the countrey to come in, and be baptized, becauſe they might go many a mile in theſe hot countreys, and not meet with a drop of water, and it was a great priviledge accounted to theſe places that banked on *Iordan*, that they had much water; but what argument is this to prove that *Iohn* plunged all he baptized?

The Argument according to their form muſt be thus; *Iohn* baptized in *Ænon*, becauſe there was much water; *Ergo*, baptizing is by dipping all the whole body: this is a dangerous and ominous way of arguing to thoſe who deny conſequences, and deductions, for to warrant duties without expreſs ſyllabical precept; I hope they will allow us the ſame priviledge of demonſtration, when we ſay, whole houſes were baptized, *Ergo*, Infants and Children, who are the pillars of a houſe; is not this more fair and probable, then that *Iohn* plunged their whole body, becauſe there was much water? There is none of our conſequences for Infants baptiſm ſo ſtrained and far fetcht, as we have demonſtrated formerly; it was neceſſary for them that had ſo many of ſeveral parts to baptize, to go where there may be much water, when they could get hardly a drop many miles round about, and yet not immerſe every one they baptized; you may in *England* go 20 miles in ſome countreys, and not find a river to plunge a mans whole body under the

water, what would it be in *Spain*, and the other hot countreys, where water is sold as wine and bear with us, how far might they go ere they could get a river to plunge themselves in? Thus you see how little reason they have from these Scriptures to be so preremptory and rigid, as to make the essence of baptism to be dipping, or plunging all the body.

The last pretence commonly urged for this dipping, is from the analogie it hath with Christs burial, from that *Rom* 6.4. *Col.*2.12 *Buried with him in baptism*; hence say they it is clear one must be dipt under water, else it will not represent a burial. In this they put all their confidence, and therefore let us seriously view their strength.

Sol. First, let it be considered that they still make use of consequences, to prove institutions, which they will not allow us.

But more particularly, 1. Plunging the whole body into the water, doth not hold similitude neither with Christs burial, nor the manner of burials in the most part of the world; for first, for Christs burial and the manner of it, was not by throwing under the earth, for Christs body was wrapt in a linnen cloth by *Ioseph*, and laid in a Tomb, or Sepulchre, hewen out of a rock, for that was the custome of the Jews, *è rupe specum excavare condendis corporibus*: Matth.27.60. *To cut out a place like a cave*, or den, *out of a rock, to lay their dead bodies in*, as is observed by a man of great learning, and diligence: thus when we sleep in our houses we may be said to be buried, having something over our heads. Secondly,

Secondly, the manner of burying in *Europe* is not by plunging the body into a pit of duſt, but by caſting duſt or dung on the perſon: ſo that their pouring out water on an Infant as a paſſive ſubject, ſeems more to anſwer the ſimilitude of burying, then the caſting into the water, wherein there is ſome motion of the party himſelf contributing to his baptizing.

Thirdly, no man is ſaid to be buried who falls into the water, or under earth, without he ſtay there ſome conſiderable time.

Fourthly, we are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, in regard of the ſpiritual union we have with Chriſt in his death, and burial; and this is as much ſignified by pouring water on a perſon (as earth on a dead body) as well, I ſay, as by plunging.

Let us now conſider what remains to be ſaid againſt this abſolute rule, as they would make it; you have ſeen all their main places for plunging, with what demonſtration, at the beſt *ex probabilibus & incertis*, out of probable and uncertain conjectures, which they ſo much tax us withall, and yet the eye ſees not it ſelf.

Let us now go on, and conſider what other places of Scripture ſpeak more direct to qualifie this rigid opinion of plunging.

When *John* began firſt to adminiſter his office, it is ſaid *Mat.*3.5. *That Ieruſalem, and all Iudea, and all the regions round about Iordan went forth to* John, *and were baptized of him in Iordan*: A man had need have

good ſtore of confidence to perſwade himſelf and others, that all theſe people were baptized by plunging their whole body into *Iordan*, or that they were dipt in their cloaths, or came with any prepared garments for that purpoſe; all which are neceſſary circumſtances to be conſidered; doubtleſs they were many thouſands that came forth, for the denomination is from the greater number; all *Iudea* and *Hieruſalem*, &c. that is, a very great many, or the greateſt number of theſe Inhabitants; and how they could be thus baptized, men and women, in their cloaths promiſcuouſly, or how they could get garments ſo ready as to make the act decent, or what places they could have, ſeeing there were ſo many, for the women and the men, to prepare themſelves for the comely adminiſtration of ſuch an Ordinance, I cannot imagine; we hear *John* baptized ſo many, but in what manner is uncertain; and that which is ſo hotly contended for moſt improbable, all things duely conſidered.

The like is of that, 2 *Acts* 41. where 3000. were baptized in one day by the Apoſtle, which if it were performed by plunging, could not but be accompanied with the like inconveniences: ſo that it is only ſaid they were baptized, not how; and the word, as you have ſeen, is not ſo ſtrictly to be appropriated to dipping, but admits of a more large ſignification.

Firſt, of the ſame conſideration is that place, *Acts* 8.12. where it is expreſly ſaid, that men and women were baptized together, and on a ſudden, which can hardly

hardly be conceived how it could be done with that gravity the Goſpel requires, by plunging in their own proper habits; and ſuch ſudden acts could not be done with ſuitable preparations of garments.

But to come to particular inſtances, and parallel them together with former places, which are brought to prove this kind of dipping; and let us judge which hath more demonſtration. *Acts* 9.18. *Paul* was baptized in the houſe of *Judas*; there is nothing of a *Jordan* or *Ænon*, a river that he was carried unto; neither can they by any thing prove that *Paul* was thus dipt, but only their good will to have it ſo; neither is it probable that every houſe had a deep pond belonging to it, or a river running through it, or ſo vaſt a receptacle or ciſtern to hold water as to plunge a mans whole body in it.

Secondly, conſider the Jailors caſe, *Acts* 16.33. he was baptized in the priſon, and at midnight, he and his houſe; he waſhed their ſtripes, and they waſhed him in token of remiſſion of ſins.

All that the moſt rational and profound Critick of that judgement can ſay, is onely this; That it may be ſuppoſed he had ſome great veſſel, which ſome had in theſe hot countreys for waſhing themſelves in, and ſo made uſe of it himſelf to be baptized; but what a poor ſuppoſition in this? there is nothing either in the text, or from reaſon to countenance it; who can imagine that in theſe hot countreys, where water is ſo ſcarce and precious, a poor Jaylor ſhould have ſuch a veſſel of ſo large and vaſt a continent, which muſt

coſt

coſt much; or that the State would provide ſuch a veſſel in the Priſon to bathe and refreſh Priſoners who are under ſuſpition, or cenſures of all ſorts of crimes againſt the State? but no more of that; its too groſs to conceive: And why may not we as well argue thus; The Jaylor was baptized late in the night in the Priſon; *Ergo*, not by plunging, but waſhing or pouring out water on him, as they argue from *Joh.* 3. 23. *John* was baptizing in *Ænon* near *Salem*, becauſe there was much water there; *Ergo*, he baptized by plunging; I leave it to any ſober judgement to determine; if the one prove that baptizing may be by dipping, the other proves it may be by ſome other way.

Thus you ſee the Scripture is not ſo preremptory as theſe men are, but hath left the method of baptizing in general, and under a latitude: Neither can they bring one expreſs place which holds it forth either in precept or preſident (which they call for from us to ſhew them for our judgement, and will not be ſatisfied in all other conſiderations) and have no more but conjectural conſequences to prove their abſolute determinations, but what their confidence ſupplies: And if there be any abſolute need of dipping, it is to cool the heat of theſe mens ſpirits, who deny Baptiſm to be true, becauſe they have not been plunged.

The ſum of all is this; They affirm the word, *To baptize*, ſignifies only immerſion, plunging or dipping the whole body under water; we deny it, and ſhew

that

that it signifies to wash by pouring on water, and more often in the Old and New Testament; and that when this word is used in the Scripture, its opposed to other words that signifie properly dousing, or casting under water: And I think I may say it without too much rashness, that they can hardly bring one explicit place in the Old or New Testament, where the word, *To baptize*, is used positively for plunging or dousing under water; and doubtless the most of that judgement know not what the meaning of the words are, else they would not lay the essence of Baptism on a word of such a large use.

The Scriptures being thus cleared, to speak at least, that plunging is not absolutely necessary to constitute the truth of Baptism: Let us now come to consider the morality of this judgement, and the practical conveniencies or inconveniencies of this way of plunging; for if it be the only and pure Gospel-way, it will have no ominous or uncomely aspect on other rules, which are from the same authority, nor any way asperse the Gospel.

1. I know not how to believe that Christ would ordain any Ordinance, and tye souls strictly to it, that cannot be practised universally by all, and but in some places, and at some seasons, without manifold inconveniencies and dangers unto nature: For if only dipping should be baptizing, and every one that believes ought presently to be baptized, how shall they do that live in those hot and dry Countryes where water is so scarce, as it is in many places of the world,

world, who muſt be forced to go ſo many miles to come to a River, and yet may only find it a ſmall Brook, with which they can hardly wet their feet in paſſing over, as it is in many places of the World?

And if there were in every place never ſo much water, yet how dangerous is it for ſome bodies who are rheumatick, and ſubject to Catarrhs and defluxions, in the winter time (for no ſeaſon ſhould hinder a man from the practice of an Ordinance) in cold and wet to be plunged into the water? it were enough to beget diſeaſes in the moſt healthy bodies; Chriſt is more tender of the bodies of his Saints, then to put them into ſuch hazards; and I hope no one will conceive baptiſm to be a charm to prevent all inconveniencies and diſeaſes on the body: yet the zeal of theſe of that way carries on ſo furiouſly, that they think its impoſſible for them to get any hurt, though they plunge themſelves into the water in froſt and ſnow: but its dangerous to tempt God out of his ordinary way of preſervation, when there is no abſolute neceſſity for ſuch a practice. Beſides, this Ordinance would be a greater yoke and burthen then Circumciſion, if this rule of theirs ſhould be ſo univerſally followed; for there was no danger to the child by that act, though it ſeemed bloody and hard: But if all perſons (for none are excluded by any weakneſs or indiſpoſition) ſhould be thus baptized, how eminent a danger would many be in? And if it prove ſo hazardous to the bodies of many healthy ones, that have in winter time but accidentally fallen

into

into the water, though they have not been under water, that it hath coſt them their lives, the violence of cold ſo piercing their bodies and animal ſpirits (of which we have many experiences) how would it be for others, who labour under daily weakneſs? And there is no promiſe that the water ſhall have no power to hurt thoſe which after this manner are baptized, no more then others. Fleſh and blood is the ſame in all, which is the immediate ſubject of ſuch an act; and God doth proportion his Ordinances to keep correſpondency with his other rules of mercy, and preſcriptions for uſe of means. In a word, if this be the only way of baptizing, happy are thoſe that live in hot Countreys, or have bodies of braſs.

Its ſaid, if it be an Ordinance, God will preſerve; but that is the qeeſtion; and that which demonſtrates it, is not the only way; if it be a way at all, it is, That it croſſeth Gods rules for preſervation of a mans ſelf; the practice of it at ſome times being a kind of a decree of ſelf-murther, and very unſutable to the laws of mercy and tenderneſs, that command the very heart of Chriſt; and ſuch an abſolute unqualified command doth not look like an Ordinance of the Goſpel; For if baptizing be immediatly to be practiſed after believing (according to their principles) then what ſhould hinder water that they may not be baptized? Suppoſe they be ſick and weak, ſuppoſe the ſeaſon be unſutable, and yet the ſoul deſires to be baptized? You muſt either go againſt all rules

of

of nature to plunge that perſon, or elſe find out ſome other way of baptizing; or elſe a Goſpel command muſt be neglected; for there is nor precept nor preſident of delay of that Ordinance (ſtill to their own poſitions) in all the New Teſtament; and ſo both the baptizer and baptized muſt ſin in performance of a duty; for the one ſins if he by any pretence deſtroys his own health; and the other ſins in being an inſtrument in it. I wiſh men were conſiderate of the nature and effects of theſe things; which if it were more commonly practiſed, we ſhould have heaps of inſtances to make good this conſideration.

2. Its very much to be obſerved, that Chriſt who hath bid us avoid all appearance of evil, ſhould ordain any Ordinance wherein there muſt needs be ſome ſuch appearance fit for fleſh and blood to act on; I have ſo much modeſty as only to preſent this, how women, take it in what habit you will, can be baptized publickly, where all may come with men, and by men, without appearance of evil. And if the Apoſtle would have women to be vailed or covered in the Congregation, becauſe of the Angels, take it either literally or tropically, to ſhew the modeſty of Church-Aſſemblies, and to prevent any ſhadow of temptation; how can we think that its ſutable to Apoſtolical rule, that women ſhould appear in the open air, out of their wonted habit, in a garment next to nakedneſs, and ſo be plunged into water? But I am loth to enter into theſe ſecrets.

I only propound this, Whether or no that this

baptiſm

baptiſm by plunging, be not rather a baptizing of mens cloaths, and upper garments, then of the body, if the perſon baptized be not naked? and if he or ſhe be, how odious a cuſtome would that be? I cannot but think that that part that is baptized, ought to be naked, that the water may immediatly fall on that place; elſe ſomething elſe muſt be baptized primarily, and the fleſh ſecondarily and by conſequence.

This is the reaſon why we only pour water on the face, becauſe its the principalleſt part wherein the image of God moſt appears, and the ſoul ſhines forth moſt eminently, on which all the workings of mens humors and affections leave the viſibleſt impreſſion and ſymptomes. And its obſervable, that the ſame word in the Greek (προσωπον) ſignifies both the face and the perſon, becauſe the whole perſon is repreſented by the face. And thus we baptize the perſon in baptizing his face, which we can look on, and waſh naked, and not be aſhamed. Let theſe men that are ſo zealous for dipping and plunging the whole body, conſider from all this, what warrant they have from Scripture for their ſo much rigid confidence.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

An explication of that place, Heb. 10. 22. *About waſhing the whole body with pure water; the improper application of it to their manner of baptizing by plunging the whole body.*

AFter all ſtrainings and ſhifts of the Antipedobaptiſts, this place in *Heb.* 10. 22. is forced in to give evidence for that manner of baptizing, formerly ſo much contended for. *Let us draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evil conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*; from hence they infer baptizing muſt be by dipping and plunging, or waſhing the body throughout.

Let us review it with its context, and we ſhall find they chew but upon a dry bone. For,

Firſt, the ſcope of the Apoſtle in all this chapter, is not in the leaſt to diſcover the manner of baptizing, but to open two things.

1. The fulneſs of the ſatisfaction and merit of Chriſts offering himſelf, and being a ſacrifice for remiſſion of ſins, in oppoſition to all Legal, and ſhadowy offerings, as appears from the 1. v. unto the 29.

which

which was begun to be demonſtrated in the former chapters, eſpecially the 9. chap.

2. To encourage ſouls in their approaches to God on ſuch a glorious account now in the New Teſtament, ſo in the 19. ver. *Having therefore boldneſs* (παῤῥησίαν) *or freedom, to enter into the holieſt by the blood of Jeſus, by a new and living way, &c.* In this 22. v. he bids them draw nigh with a true heart, and full aſſurance of faith, &c.

Secondly, that his ſcope or intent is not to open the manner of baptizing, is evident; for he writes to thoſe that were baptized already as theſe Hebrews were; for you have no controverſie in this Epiſtle about circumciſion and baptiſm, as in the *Rom. Gall. Phil: Coloſ.* but only concerning Chriſts prieſtly Office, eſpecially compared with the Levitical, Aaronical Prieſthood, and the virtue of Legal-ceremonial ſacrifices, and the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt as High-prieſt, as any one that runs may read; now either they muſt ſay theſe were not baptized before, or elſe muſt conclude that his deſign is not to inform them (and that ſo tranſiently) of the nature or manner of adminiſtring of that Ordinance.

Thirdly, the Apoſtle here doth directly inſtruct the ſoul how to make confident addreſſes to God, *viz.* from the ſenſe of our juſtification and ſanctification together; for ſo by our hearts being ſprinkled from an evil conſcience, is meant, & can be meant no other then Chriſts blood ſprinkled on our ſouls, in the aſſurance of our abſolution from ſin, and the waſhing

with pure water no more (but by this outward expreſſion) of the purity of our converſations, as to ſanctification, that we may not come with ſcandal of external unholineſs, when we pretend to be juſtified by Chriſts blood.

Fourthly, the uſual word is here left out which expreſſeth that Ordinance; and it is your bodies not baptized but waſhed (λελουμένοι) which is a clear alluſion to that of *Levit.* 16. 4. from whence it ſeems to be excerpted, when *Aaron* the high Prieſt was to enter into the holy place, and before he was to be attired for that work, it is ſaid, *He ſhall waſh his fleſh in water, and ſo put them on*; the 70. tranſlate the words thus, λέσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, *He ſhall waſh his whole body with water*, to ſignifie the holineſs he ſhould have in his perſon, as from external publick pollutions; the very ſame intent of the Apoſtle is here, that if we would be confident before God, when we approach unto God, we muſt come with Chriſts blood on our conſciences, and no known pollution on our converſations; and if we will follow their grounds from comparing theſe two places, we may conclude that baptiſm was as much an Ordinance of the Old Teſtament, as the New, for waſhing; the body was uſed in both.

Fifthly, it is a uſual phraſe in Scripture to expreſs the ſanctification of our perſons, from inward & outward defilements, by the waſhing of water and waſhing the body, & yet not in the leaſt to hint out the manner of baptizing by water, as into the ſpecial adminiſtration of

of that Ordinance; thus in *Esa.* 1. 16. when God saith to his backsliding people, wash you, make you clean; must he needs mean, go and be baptized? but that outward expression is put for the reforming of their wayes, and expounded by putting away the evil from their doings or works; thus in *Joh.* 13. Christ expresseth justification and sanctification, by washing in general, and then washing the feet; he that is washed, (which is not baptized; for Christ saith he must wash, or else *Peter* could have no part in him; and Christ did not baptize) such a one need no more but to wash his feet, that is, walk holily; so that here is washing, and washing of the feet, and yet neither meant of baptizing nor washing: Thus likewise in the *Corinthians* it is said, as to their sanctification, *Now you are washed, now you are cleansed, now you are justified*; he means not Now you are baptized, but of the special purification of their hearts, and lives from their former pollutions of flesh and spirit; which though signified by baptism, yet so remotely, as no man can gather the constant method of exterual baptism from it.

Sixthly, he saith your bodies washed (ὑδατι καθαρῳ) with clean or pure water; now I hope, as to baptizing, none are so foolish as to stand on it, whether they be baptized after a rain when the water is puddled, or whether only in pure & chrystal streams, from an unpuddled spring or ocean; and yet they must be tied to the one as the other, if this Text be their president; and we may as well question from

this Text, whether they be rightly baptized, if there be any mud, or ſlime, or filth in the water, as whether we be baptized if all our bodies be not waſhed; but now this expreſſion to ſet forth holineſs and ſanctification, is moſt apt and full of life: our hearts and converſations, in drawing nigh unto God, ſhould be as if externally they were waſhed with clean water, tranſparent and ſpotleſs before him, ſhining with an Evangelical brightneſs, and ſpiritual purity; for it will be very hard to draw nigh to God with a good conſcience, and a tainted and beſmeared body or converſation, with unholy acts, whereby God is ſo much diſhonoured; eſpecially to come, as the Apoſtle ſaith in the former part of the verſe, *with a true heart and full aſſurance of faith.*

Seventhly, if he had meant by this waſhing of the body, baptizing, he would not have made ſuch a diſproportion (according to their own rule) between the ſign and thing ſignified; for he ſpeaks of the heart being only ſprinkled, and yet the body waſhed with clean water; now if baptiſm doth not ſignifie and ſeal juſtification, as well as ſanctification, it is not a ſeal of the Covenant of grace; and if it do ſignifie, it cannot go beyond the thing ſignified in expreſſion and outward repreſentation. And if Chriſts blood in *Heb.* 12.24. be called the blood of ſprinkling, and it be one of the main things ſignified and ſealed in baptiſm; well may we anſwer it by an outward act, without offence or ſin.

Eighthly, grant that by waſhing the body is meant baptizing

baptizing here (which you ſee cannot be extorted by violence, or extracted by any chymical virtue) yet it will not ſerve their turns: For,

First, the body is ſaid to be waſhed, when any one or more of the principal parts in ſight or uſe, are waſhed; and what is done to any eminent or commanding part, it carries the denomination of the whole with it; for *Maries* anointing and waſhing of Chriſts head and feet in *Luke* 7.44,45. is interpreted in *John* 11. 2. for the anointing of the Lord, as much as if ſhe had done it to all his body throughout; though it is only expreſt in the former place of the anointing and waſhing his head and feet. This is moſt uſual in Scripture.

Secondly, if they will go to the ſtrictneſs of the term of waſhing the body; then,

First, it muſt be waſhed naked, or elſe it is not a waſhing of the body.

Secondly, it muſt not be a bare dipping or plunging into water, but ſome other act muſt be done with the body, *viz.* a rinſing or rubbing, as we do pots or cloaths which we waſh, which are not ſaid to be waſhed, becauſe dipt under water, but ſo rinſed as the filth and dirt is taken out; I only urge this to ſhew inevitable inconveniences theſe men will bring on themſelves by ſuch interpretations of Scripture.

Many other conſiderations might be added, if this Tract would bear the weight of them.

CHAP. XVII.

A ſhort ſumming up of the former principles, and arguing them from the method of the Apoſtle Peter *about thoſe he baptized,* Acts 10. 47.

THat we may bring up all unto a full concluſion, let that place be conſidered, *Acts* 10.47. and the manner of the Apoſtles arguing in it, which is moſt ſpecial to what we would prove; his argument lies in this, *they have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we: Ergo,* what ſhould hinder water? where there is a qualification, there may be an adminiſtration of that Ordinance; this is grounded on a common principle; now if we obſerve,

Firſt, the Apoſtle changes the uſual expreſſion, and ſaith not, *Seeing they have believed as well as we,* but *ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt as well as We, What ſhould hinder?* The argument is from the equivalency of the qualification; for whereas he ſaith all along formerly, *they believed and were baptized*; and to the Eunuch, *Act.*8.37. *If thou believeſt thou maiſt*; but here, *ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt as well as We*; this change of phraſe ſhews the qualification not to lie in one term or expreſſion, but in the univerſal equality of Goſpel manifeſtation, to ſome

ſome one way, to ſome another; that if any title in the Goſpel can be found properly, either by Gods promiſe or our judgement, applicable to any perſon, we may ſay, What ſhould hinder water? now to receive the holy Ghoſt, is the largeſt and moſt vaſt expreſſion, as to a qualification, that ever could be mentioned, taking in both real graces and all external gifts and priviledges, which are all conveyed by that holy Spirit, whether common or ſpecial, as is before expreſt in another Chapter.

We ſhall deſire on the Apoſtles account to argue from all theſe pregnant Texts of Scripture concerning Infants; and having the ſame premiſes we ſhall not certainly draw a wrong concluſion, when we find the Scriptures giving ſuch titles to Infants, and ſo many ſpecial carriages of Chriſt to them, which amounts to as much as is ſpoken of any that were baptized, why may not we ſay with *Peter*, *What ſhould hinder water?* as for inſtance,

If Infants be in the Covenant, that *Abrahams* promiſe belongs to them, as we have proved, *What ſhould hinder Water?*

If Infants be holy, *What ſhould hinder water?* Theſe which are viſible Saints may be baptized; but ſo are the Infants of believers; for they are called (ἅγια) 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. The ſame name given to denominate all Saints; now to be holy is as much as to be a believer, as to receive the holy Ghoſt is made all one with being a believer; and what then ſhould hinder water?

So

So again, when the Gentiles and their posterity are ingraffed into the same root, *Rom.* 11. which is *Abraham* and the Covenant, and the branches holy as the root, what should hinder water?

If Christ was angry when Infants were forbidden to come to him, and charged his Disciples to suffer them to be brought, who can forbid water? especially when Christ took them up in his arms, laid his hands on, and blessed them, which is as much and more then is done in baptism, what should hinder water to be cast on them? and so we may argue from every place in the former discourse, upon this very principle; for the Apostle argues neither from precept nor example, but from a parallel qualification, because they had received the holy Ghost; and surely all these places of Scripture concerning Infants, will fully amount to make up an equivalent qualification in them to a visible profession of grown persons, and so we may argue on the same ground with *Peter*; besides, Infants are capable of receiving the holy Ghost as well as grown persons, and why not capable of water? if they say it is only a visible believer, a visible professor that is the subject; We answer,

You see the Apostle useth several expressions about it, sometimes actively, sometimes passively, sometimes if thou believest; here seeing they have received the holy Ghost, but never saith a visible Saint, or a visible believer, or one that actually professeth; and so may we say, seeing the promise is to them, seeing they are holy, seeing they are called Disciples, seeing

ing they had Christs hands laid on them, and were blessed, seeing they are capable of receiving the holy Ghost, what should hinder water?

Quest. If they say still there is no command; I answer,

First, there is as much as is said of others that were baptized.

Secondly, there is no command in terms from Christ or his Apostles to baptize professing believers, or those that should receive the holy Ghost; yet they were baptized.

Thirdly, where there is parallel characters to shew qualification, there may be the same outward sign applied; on this principle the Apostle reasons in this Scripture; it is only to be wondred how so many direct places of Scripture, which cannot but sparkle in the consciences of those which are diligent and diving into truth, can be so lightly evaded and made nothing of, while men pretend to search truth impartially, without deceit or guile.

Chap. XVIII.

Wherein is ſhewed who is to adminiſter this Ordinance of baptiſm, according to the rule of the Goſpel.

As theſe that are contrary to Infant baptiſm are ſtrict, and moſt ſevere in other circumſtances, which they think muſt be in that Ordinance, ſo they are moſt ſlight and rude in their conſiderations and practiſe, as to the adminiſtrator of that Ordinance, making every male Diſciple, or any one that can give an occaſional word of exhortation, the miniſter of this Ordinance, which they do otherwiſe ſhut up, as in the moſt holy place, and put the very ſubſtance of the Goſpel in it; this is moſt unſutable to the Goſpel, and makes baptiſm one of the pooreſt and loweſt Ordinances, and of no ſuch ſolemnity, ſeeing every Diſciple may baptize another, and he that can ſpeak any thing of the Goſpel may do ſuch an act.

But if we trace the rule, we ſhall ſee, that as it is an Ordinance of publick cognizance, ſo it muſt be adminiſtred by a publick Officer, who hath received commiſſion authoritatively from Chriſt and his Church, and that it was never adminiſtred by any one but he that was either ordinarily, or extraordinarily called thereunto; begin with *John* the Baptiſt, ſo called from his work and deſignment to the adminiſtration of

of that Ordinance; he was extraordinarily called, as the propheſies of him witneſs, with the circumſtances of his birth and behaviour, *Luk.* 1. 7, &c. *Matth.* 3. 1, 2, 3.

All the time of Chriſts miniſtry, his Diſciples by immediate commiſſion from himſelf baptized, and none elſe: and we all know how they were called, and who gave them power.

When Chriſt gave up all his power and authority to be continued to the end of the world, or his ſecond coming, *Matth.* 28. *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*, and gave them their general and publick commiſſion, he gave it to theſe that were to be Apoſtles, and to theſe that ſhould ſucceed them in ordinary, and as by ſettled commiſſion, not to every one that ſhould be made a Diſciple; this was a commiſſion to them at large, and yet appropriated to ſuch an order, without we will ſay all are commiſſioned to teach and baptize.

Afterwards, when the Goſpel order of Churches came to be ſetled, and particular inſtructions given, as to the foundation and method of adminiſtration in Churches, it was never adminiſtred by any but thoſe that were for the time extraordinary, or ordinary ſetled Officers of the Church, whoſe names are ſummed up in 1 *Cor.* 12.28,29. and *Eph.* 4. 11. Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers; beſides theſe, none have office or power to ſuch adminiſtration but only theſe.

Thoſe that are the more ſober and intelligent ſort of

of our oppoſites, grant us this, that the adminiſtration of baptiſm is of publick cognizance; and that ordinarily it muſt be adminiſtred by thoſe which are in publick and ſet office; but generally every brother among them of any ſuppoſed gift may be a baptizer.

As for *Philip* and *Ananias*, who baptized, the firſt was an Evangeliſt, an extraordinary officer, as the Apoſtles, raiſed and inſpirited, and impowred much after the ſame manner; and if we conſult with *Acts* 8. he had ſpecial commiſſion and authority from heaven, by a Divine call, to perform that act on the Eunuch; and ſo for *Ananias* who baptized *Paul*, as one of their own judgement ſaith well, he was deputed in an extraordinary manner to that miniſtery, *Act.* 9. the Lord appearing to him in a viſion; and theſe examples cannot be drawn into an ordinary rule, without the ſame circumſtances be found uſual.

And it muſt needs be ſo that none but one of the ſetled officers of the Church, who is to preach the Goſpel, may be a baptizer.

Firſt, becauſe it is a Church Ordinance; Chriſt hath now left the keyes to the Church, ſet in the Church ſucceſſively ſuch perſons who are actually to adminiſter all Ordinances in it; and if it be a Church Ordinance, onely theſe may adminiſter it who are called to one of theſe offices in the Church; all grant this, that it is a Church Ordinance, though ſome take the Church more largely, others more ſtrictly.

Secondly, it is an act of power to baptize, *Mat.* 28.

All

All power is given to me in heaven and earth; Go teach and baptize; now power is conveyed by a ſpeciall commiſſion and call. For a man to exerciſe a gift of knowledge by utterance, needs no ſuch ſolemnity; but to baptize, it being a ſealing of a ſpecial priviledge to others, muſt come from an office-power, and ſo cannot ordinarily be adminiſtred by a gifted Diſciple.

Thirdly, there would be no diſtinction as to power, between Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers, in adminiſtration of any Ordinance, and every brother of the Church, if their rule ſtand; this is the common confuſion of the moſt of the contrary judgement, which utterly overthrows the other of Goſpel Churches.

CHAP.

Chap. XIX.

On Christs being baptized by John, *when he was about the thirtieth year of his age; whether any thing can be gathered from it against baptizing of Infants?*

This is the last plea urged from Christs example, that he was not baptized untill about the thirtieth year, therefore none but grown persons ought to be baptized, if there be any force in Christs example.

To which is answered, 1. In general, actings are not always to be our examples; for some act he did meerly as Mediator, God-man, unimitable by us, as to be crucified for our sins; some he did out of special reason, and eminent emergency, as to fast forty dayes and nights in the wilderness, with many such like, up and down the Scripture, that are no rules to us; his personal and representative acts, and these which have been acted upon extraordinary occasion and reason, cannot be drawn into practical rule of example to us.

2. If we will take Christs example for a rule in this, that he was baptized when so grown up, why then we may as well take Christs practise, as our example, in the active sense, *he baptized none*, therefore none are to baptize; the same holds as strong as the other; if any say the rule afterward warrants that,

so

so it doth the baptizing of Infants, as hath been formerly proved.

3. And more home, Christ was a Saint in the womb, he professed his faith from a childe, disputed with the Doctors about Divine things when he was but 12. years old, so that he could be baptized with an infallible evidence at first, and yet was not baptized untill such an age; hence if we will follow Christs example, though men be known to be professors, and never so godly, yet they must not be baptized untill just they come to the same stature, and term of years that Christ was baptized in; the reason is stronger for the one then the other, because Christ, though he had such a visible, such an infallible right to it, yet did abstain from the practise of it, untill just such a time, which he chose out as fittest, so that the time hath as much force to make an example, and binds as strictly to the observance of it, as the general consideration of him, as a grown person: upon this account no man must be baptized untill he be 29. or full 30. years of age.

4. There may be many considerations why Christ was baptized at years.

1. That he might enter on his publique ministry with the more greater solemnity of such an Ordinance, and have a testimony from heaven to him in that Ordinance, which was given, *The Holy Ghost descending on him in the form of a Dove*, *Mat.* 3. two last *v.* Now Christs entrance into his publique ministry, began immediately after his baptism, how he con-

verst

verſt for the moſt part of the former years, is very dark in Scripture.

2. It might be alſo, becauſe he would give a teſtimony to *John Baptiſt*, who, though he was deſigned from the womb to that work, yet began to act his office but a little while before, and had ſoon done. It is a queſtion whether he baptized anyconſiderable time after he baptized Chriſt; but juſt as Chriſt did ariſe in his miniſtry, *John* fell in his.

3. As there is no reaſon to be given why Chriſt ſhould live ſo long, and not take on him his publique miniſtry, untill ſuch an age, nor may it be urged as ſuch an example to us; ſo there is no reaſon peremptorily to be given why he was not baptized untill then, and ſo the rule is uncertain, and of no value. But this example is contrary to the following rule left for baptizing, according to their own principles: For,

1. That Ordinance was immediatly adminiſtred (as they) after believing, and profeſſion; Chriſt was a known Believer, and Profeſſor before; neither did he make a new profeſſion to *John* when he came to be baptized; but *John* rather ſcrupled it as an act too high for him to perform, as to ſuch a glorious perſon, *Mat.* 3. *ſuffer it to be done* (ſaith Chriſt) &c. It would be a ſin for us to delay ſo long.

2. Chriſts Baptiſm was upon no other grounds then ours, his to fulfill all righteouſneſs in our ſtead, or to waſh away unrighteouſneſs, the filth of the fleſh, and ſpirit, as an outward ſign of it, and ſo can-

cannot come under the common rule; this I conceive ſufficient to be ſpoken as to that conſideration; *there onely remains*, that queſtion which will eaſily be anſwered on the former grounds, if they prove true, as they are demonſtrated, *The Lord give a bleſſing to theſe conſiderations on your heart.*

M CHAP.

Chap. XX.

That Baptism doth not form a Church.

SO much do our opposites advance Baptism, that they make it the only constitutive principle of a Gospel Church, by which men enter into the Church, and are made visible Members onely by its administration, and in their own method. But we shall soon dethrone that position by the authority and force of Scripture and rational argumentation.

Onely in general, I doubt our Divines have unwittingly given them too much ground to affirm as they do, calling it an entrance into the Church, an initiating Ordinance, seal, and by their practice of late to set the Font nigh the Church porch; though I would not much stand upon it, how proper it is to call it an initiating Ordinance: (a phrase I have used in this discourse *Pro forma*) without it be because it is the first seal to be administred in the Order of Sacraments; but it will be easily proved that Baptism gives no essence or being either to a Church, or membership.

1. Because a man must be a member, and of a Church, ere he can be Baptized according to the Gospell rule.

2. Sacraments are Ordinances to be administred in the Church, and to the Church, which supposeth the existence of the Church before; thus 1 *Cor.* 12.28. *Ephes*

Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13. the Lord hath set in, and given all officers to the Church, if so, Sacraments, which must be administred by officers, if rightly.

3. A Church may be without Baptism, and yet be as true and as real a Church; as the *Isralites* were so long in the wilderness without Circumcision which was as much an initiating Ordinance, as ever Baptism was; now nothing can be without its form and exist.

4. That cannot be the form of a Church or make a man a Member, which remains the same, and untouched after excommunication, whereby a man is cut off from membership at present, but now though the Church may take away his membership, they cannot his Baptism, which is the same still, and is not lost.

5. For this is an absolute rule, that that which gives the form, or being to a Church, it must cease when the Church ceaseth, or when a Member ceaseth to be a Member, it must cease with it; and that must be renewed, as often as membership is renewed, and so one must be Baptized again, as often as he renews Membership; this is most absurd, yet must follow from such a principle.

6. Baptism is a sign, and seal, therefore gives no being to any thing, but confirms it; It is a consequent act, and supposeth something pre-existent.

Obj. As for that place they so much stand on, *Act.* 2. 41. *As many as received the word gladly,*

were Baptized, and there was added that day about 3000. *ſouls* ; hence they ſay they were added by Baptiſm.

Sol. The words ſay not, they were added by Baptiſm, but puts a full point, or ſtop after that ſentence, *as many as gladly received the Word, were Baptized.* There that ſentence ends. And the Apoſtle goes on a new account ; and ſaith, *there were added that day* 3000. *ſouls*, but doth not at all ſhew the manner of their adding; ſo that theſe words are rather a recapitulation, and ſumming up the number of Church Members added that day, then any deſcription of the way of their taking into the Church : as if one ſhould ſay, he had 3000 l. in gold added to his eſtate, he only ſhews it is ſo, but not how he came to have that added, ſo it muſt be here ; and the former reaſons prove the impoſſibility of ſuch an interpretation.

2. *Obj.* There is one place more urged to prove Baptiſm to be the form of a Church, and that which makes a Member, which is, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *We are all Baptized into one body*, there Baptiſm onely embodyes members.

Sol. To which I anſwer firſt, The Apoſtle ſpeaks there primarily of this Baptiſm of the Spirit, not of water; So by one Spirit, we are Baptized into one Body, not ſo much of Baptiſm by water.

But ſecondly, grant it to be meant of Baptiſm by water, yet it proves nothing that Baptiſm is the form of that body, which hath its matter and form, holineſs, and union before baptiſm ; baptized into one

one body, doth not here ſhew the eſſential conſtitution of a Church, but the confirmed union.

For firſt, we are ſaid in *Gal.* 3.27. *to be Baptized into Chriſt*; now none will conjecture that baptiſm gives the form of union with Chriſt, but onely ſeals it; ſo into one body, may be as to the unity of communion in the ſame body.

2. The phraſe of baptizing into, or in one body, ſhews the body exiſtent, and in perfect being before, elſe we could not be baptized in a body, or into a body; for when one is baptized firſt, into what body is he, and the ſecond, and third incorporated? untill a body be compleat, they cannot be ſaid to be baptized into it, or in it; therefore baptiſm cannot conſtitute the form of a Church, which is this body, ſaying, we are baptized into it, that is, to hold union and communion with ſuch a body.

3. This argument is inſerted more to prevent Schiſm, then to expreſs the way of firſt embodying or conſtitution of Churches, as the whole context demonſtrates.

4. It is the ſame reaſon with the Lords Supper, and we may as well be ſaid as to the firſt conſtitution, to conſtitute Churches by that Sacrament, as by baptiſm, 1 *Cor.*10.16,17. *The cup of bleſſing we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the blood of Chriſt? the bread that we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Chriſt? for we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.* So that we may as well be ſaid to be gathered into a Church by

the Lords Supper, as by Baptiſm, for by it we are made one body, and one Spirit.

But laſtly, if Baptiſm doth eſſentially conſtitute a Church, and is its form, then all who are Baptized are reall Members of the Church, and muſt have all priviledges, be they never ſo looſe and vain; for they have the eſſentiall qualification, and the perfect form, and what will any deſire more? and ſtrange conſequences muſt needs follow: you may make whom you will Members, and make them Members before they are Members, and Baptize into a body before there is a body, or any knowledge of what frame the body is; you may baptize and have no Church, for they may never come into Union, and Communion, who are baptized upon theſe terms, and then no Church can be conſtituted; for who ſhall baptize firſt? for he muſt have an extraordinary Commiſsion, for he can have no ordinary delegation, untill the form be introduced which makes the Church, and that form is not, untill a competent number be baptized, and ſo Church power muſt be exerciſed firſt without a Church, and political power without a body.

It is wonderful to imagine how theſe that differ, ſlight and unchurch all the Congregations, though made up of the pureſt, and ſpecialleſt Saints, without mixtures of humane allay, and meerly in this principle they are not baptized in their form, nor plunged under water, which with them is onely baptizing; and under this principle, Faith, and Repentance, and

the

the moſt reſplendent graces of the beſt Saints muſt lye buried, and no Church, if not thus dipt: I hope you ſee the fallacy, if not the perfect folly of this poſition, and how Churches ſtand upon other principles more firm, and ſure; though we would not loſe any ornament of the Goſpel to adorn this body, yet we dare not conſtitute it of ſuch ingredients.

M 4 A GOSPEL-

A GOSPEL-ORDINANCE

CONCERNING

The ſinging of Scripture-Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs; the lawfulneſs of that Ordinance.

LONDON,
Printed for *R. W.* and are to be ſold at the *three Daggers* in *Fleetſtreet*. 1654.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the ſinging of Scripture-Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs; the lawfulneſs of that Ordinance.

THE next publick controverſie which Satan hath raiſed to diſturb the Churches, is about the practiſe of ſinging Scripture-Pſalms, on purpoſe to deprive the Saints of the benefit of that ſoul-raiſing, and heart-raviſhing Ordinance, by which God is publickly and ſolemnly praiſed, and the ſpirits filled with the glory of God; and becauſe your hearts may be ſtabliſhed in every truth, and not ſo eaſily perſwaded to part with ſuch a holy Ordinance, I could not but endeavor to clear up this alſo, which you have in this method.

Firſt, that ſinging of Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs, vocally with the voice, and muſically, is an Ordinance of the New Teſtament, conſtantly to be practiſed in the Churches of Chriſt.

Secondly,

Secondly, Open unto you the three expreſsions, Pſalms, Hymns, and Songs, wherein they agree, and whether there be any difference between them.

Thirdly, ſhew you that it is the Pſalms of *David*, *Aſaph*, *Heman*, and the Hymns and ſpiritual Songs of theſe holy men, which are recorded in Scripture, that is the matter ordinarily to be ſung.

Fourthly, anſwer the main objections of the diſſenters; theſe are ſcattered up and down this ſmall Treatiſe.

For the firſt, it is clear from *Eph.*5.19. he bids them be filled with the Spirit, λαλοῦντες, ſpeaking to one another, and in *Col.*3.16. *Teaching and admoniſhing one another*, διδάσκοντες, καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς; What ever theſe be as to the matter of them, yet the ſinging of them is commanded as an Ordinance, and a ſpecial Ordinance for edification; That the Apoſtle exhorts here to this as an Ordinance, is clear;

Firſt, becauſe he ſpeaks to the whole Church, and as a publick dutie, not appropriated to any Office, but as a commandment univerſal on all.

Secondly, he doth diſtinguiſh this Ordinance from that of preaching or teaching doctrinally, which belongs to the Officer, or occaſionally to a gifted brother; for he doth not only ſay, as in other places, teach and admoniſh; but in Pſalms, and Hymns, and Songs, which ſhews the manner of the teaching and admoniſhing, not in the general, but in ſuch a way as by ſinging with Pſalms, &c. and as Mr. *Cotton* well obſerves,

obſerves, if the Apoſtle had meant the ordinary and common way of teaching, he would have ſaid, teach one another out of the Pſalms, or from them, rather then in, or with them, which is the uſual language of the holy Ghoſt in expreſsing ſuch a duty; ſo in *Pauls* example, *Act.* 28. 23. & ſo *Philip* is ſaid to preach Jeſus to the Eunuch, (ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης) from that Scripture in Eſaiah; and ſurely he would never have added the word (ᾄδοντες) in the following part, ſinging with melodie in your hearts, if this teaching and admoniſhing were not to be diſcovered in ſuch a peculiar Ordinance. To which places we muſt add that of the 1 *Cor.* 14. 15, 16. where the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the Church, as to the orderly adminiſtration of that Ordinance, 16, 17. v. where he ſpeaks of ſinging as a diſtinct dutie, and to be done in publick before the Church; and that phraſe of ſinging with the ſpirit, and with underſtanding, is very emphatical, as Divines obſerve; for I cannot ſing with the ſpirit, but I muſt alſo with underſtanding; but the underſtanding here, muſt be meant of others who hear me, and joyn with me in that act; however, publick ſinging was then an Ordinance ſolemnized in the Church; and we ſhall hereafter ſee what kind theſe Pſalms were they ſung; Thus *James* 5. 13. *If any be merry, let him ſing Pſalms*; though this be particular in the Text, yet it is of the ſame conſideration with the former; and theſe places hold forth the inſtitution; ſinging is an Ordinance, and a ſpecial one in the Goſpel.

Secondly,

Secondly, that it is not only meant of an inward frame of rejoycing; but that it is of the voice, is moſt apparent:

Firſt, from the very words of theſe Texts; *Speaking to one another, teaching one another, in Pſalms, and Hymns*, &c. Now no man can ſpeak to edifie others by inward workings, or ſilent rejoycings.

2. Beſides the melody to be made in our hearts, we muſt ſing with melody, which ſhews not only the inward frame, but the outward act, and order; for melody in the heart were enough to expreſs the inward grace; but he adds an outward expreſsion, *Singing with melody in your hearts*; ſo that it is with the voice as with the heart.

3. Singing in Scripture is ever put in diſtinction from bare reading or ſpeaking; and commonly ſignifies a modulation of the tongue, or expreſsing any thing muſically and in tune, and ſo it is a muſical ſpeaking.

4. There would be the greateſt confuſion of Ordinances; for preaching and prayer would be made all one with ſinging; nay, internal works would be found contrary to outward expreſsions; and if there be any ſuch thing as preaching, and prayer, and exhortation, it muſt be different from ſinging, even to the moſt ignorant; for no man will ſay, when a man meerly ſpeaks or preaches, he ſings, without his tone do make them call him a ſinging preacher or talker, as too many either out of affectation or cuſtome, have given juſt cauſe to ſuſpect.

5. This

5. This is undeniable, if there be any such command as to sing, it is visible; for else no man could at any time be said to sing or not sing; it must be an outward act; for else we must say we have only souls for that Ordinance, and bodies for all the rest.

6. All that ever sung in the Gospel, as to practice, sung vocally, *Matth.* 26.30. *They went out and sung an Hymn*; that must be with an audible voice, *Act.* 16. 25. *Paul* and *Silas* sung, and all heard them; and if it be an inward act only, who shall know when men sing or think; or would they have men to be gods, to judge when men sing Psalms, and Hymns, and spiritual songs inwardly? what need these names outwardly? A more ungrounded opinion was never invented by the devil, and surely he hath fitted it for the weaker and most perfectly captivated sorts of proselytes, who have first lost their reasons, and then their consciences.

Can my inward joy teach another? or my private ejaculations admonish another? I wish Satan have not these men at his will: they would have singing to be an Ordinance, but no man to hear them; So that if singing be not a distinct visible Ordinance, then no man can tell what it is to sing at all, but the same with preaching, praying, talking, or only an invisible motion of the soul, known to God only; which is most absurd, when we look on the weight of these places of Scripture mentioned formerly.

Ob. If any object, If singing be with the voice, why not with other instruments, as Lute, and Harp, and Organs, &c. as in the O. T. *Sol.*

Sol. First, in the New Testament the voice and the heart are only Gods instruments; this holds forth the special way of worship from soul and body, as from one person; artificial instruments are laid aside, not natural ones.

Secondly, the voice is still required, because it is the most immediate Interpreter of the heart, and no outward instrument besides is so.

Thirdly, nothing can be expresst so significantly in outward characters, as by the voice; and the best expresions of God we have in words, and the tongue can best make out them.

Fourthly, the union of heart, and tongue, or voice, makes up the compleat expresion of Gods praises, without any other consideration; for we have not now any thing as typical to look at; as Lute, and Harp, &c. were in the Old Testament to praises; so ceremonies were to Christs sacrifice; when the substance came, they ceased; there is no need of them now, the spirit being more abundantly poured forth; and they have no significancy; but there needs soul and body alwayes to sing out Divine stories, while in this world.

Fifthly, this hath been propheſied of, and long before the New Testament dayes, by the Prophets, of singing to God with a lively voice, when the voice shall be as Lute, and Harp, and all instruments to God, as in *Esa* 52.8. (as Mr. *Cotton* in that precious Treatise of his, worthy all mens consideration) compared with *Rom.* 10.14. *Psal.* 100.1. *Psal.* 95.1, 2. all places referring prophetically to the Gospel. Sixthly,

Sixthly, if they dare grant this, that there must be no singing by voice, then they cut off themselves from any sort of singing by gift, in Psalms, or Hymns, and spiritual Songs, and any outward way of expressing Gods praises; and must blot out singing in any way publickly as to be looked after, though a person never so much inspired by the holy Ghost (after their own sense) should extemporarily compose, and breath forth the most glorious Sonnets, or heavenly *Anthems*; for what is not a duty in it self, and general in the nature of it, is not a duty to the most raised spirit, if never so well gifted in such a mysterie.

But the wiser sort of the contrary judgement, who consult with Scriptures and the nature of things, will not own the dissent of others as to this, but confess singing of Psalms must be by voice, & lay it on another foundation; that it is Psalms, &c. but not these we sing, that the command speaks of, but Psalms of another constitution, from a peculiar gift, and so to be looked on by the Church, *viz.* not to sing *Davids* Psalms, or *Asaphs*, or the like; but from the fillings of the Spirit in such a person, and on a sudden breaking forth for the edification of the Church.

I end this with what *Zanchy* saith on these places: These words ἐν χάριτι, and ἐν τῇ καρδία ὑμῶν, singing with grace in your hearts, *non excludunt vocem oris, verum excludunt hypocrisin & vanitatem, ex qua ferè loquuntur ebrii vino* (& ἐν χαρδία *valet atque* ἐκ τῆς καρδίας) they do not exclude the voice, but hypocrisie, and vanity, from which men drunk with wine do

ſing; and in your hearts, is as much as from your hearts, that is, not vainly, or as hypocritically, but as from inward ſenſe: So the Greek Scholiaſts, Μὴ τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ.

CHAP. II.

What's meant by theſe three expreſſions, Pſalms, Hymns, Spiritual Songs; *how they are uſed in the Old Teſtament and the New Teſtament; from which the matter of* ſinging *is cleared.*

THE next difference is about the matter of ſinging, which all muſt grant to be Pſalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs: but what theſe Pſalms were, &c. and how to diſtinguiſh them one from another, muſt be debated ere we can clear the point between theſe three expreſſions; ſome conſtitute one difference, ſome another.

Ψαλμοι, *Pſalms*, ſay ſome, are ſuch Songs which were ſung with other Inſtruments beſides the tongue. Ὕμνοι, *Hymns*, ſuch as are made only to expreſs the praiſes, and ſet out the excellencies of God. Ὠδαὶ, *Songs*, ſuch as contain not only praiſes, but exhortations, propheſies, thankſgiving; and theſe only ſung with the voyce and tongue.

Zanchius.

Others

Others difference them thus: *Psalms* are those which were pen'd by *David* and others, drawn up into meeter to be sung in the Temple in a musical strain. *Hymns* are those extemporal praises which break forth upon occasion from a heart filled with the Spirit, and observant of Gods goodness. *Songs* or *Odes* they call such that were premeditated not without some art: These they call the Songs of *Moses*, *Deborah*, *Hannah*, *Simeon*, *Mary*, *&c.*

Grotius.

But we shall find, if we consult the use of the words, the difference will not be considerable between them, and that they are used promiscuously in the Old Testament, from whence we must learn how they are to be taken in the New: Now,

1. I find they are used in general as the title of *Davids Psalms*, which are named promiscuously by these three words.

2. That the three Hebrew words, *viz.* מזמור *Mizmor*, שיר *Schir*, תהלם *Tehillim*, to which these three, Ψάλμος, Ὕμνος, Ὠδή, do fully answer, are used in the Psalms one for another, without distinction; and sometimes two of them joyned together as the title of one Psalm; sometimes all three joyned together in one title; we could heap up examples in this kind. *Judges* 5. 3. saith *Debroah*, אשירה אזמרה, *I will sing, I will sing unto the Lord*; it's translated by the 70; ᾄσομαι καὶ ψαλῶ here is two words; the one used for a Psalm, the other for

an Ode or Song put to expreſs one act. 1 *Chron.*16. 9. the two ſame words are tranſlated thus in the 70. ᾄσατε κύριον ὑμνήσατε, *Sing unto the Lord, ſing an Hymn unto the Lord.* In *Pſal.* 105. 3. which is the ſame Pſalm, only inſerted into the body of the Book of the Pſalms; the former word זמרו, is rendred by ψάλλετε, *ſing Pſalms*: and thus the ſame word in the ſame verſe is expreſt by theſe two words, yet hold forth one thing. In *Eſay* 12.5. זמרו is rendred ὑμνήσατε. In the title of *Pſal.* 38. 1. *Mizmor* is rendred by ᾠδὴ, which is here tranſlated *a Song*: and in moſt of the titles one is uſed for another without diſtinction: and שיר *Schir*, which is moſt uſually rendred by ᾠδὴ *a Song*, yet is alſo rendred by ψαλμὸς *a Pſalm*. *Pſal.* 45. 1. and 47. 1. And by ὕμνος, *a Hymn*, *Eſay* 42. 10. As for the other word תהלים, *Tehillim*, that comprehends fully both Hymns and Songs; it is the general title of the Book of Pſalms, where the variety of them are contained. And as ſome particular Pſalms are called in the Greek Hymns or Odes, according to the two former words: ſo this word is put at top, holding forth the ſignificancy of all the reſt, and diſtinguiſhing the Pſalms from all other Books of ſcripture as theſe that know the ſuperſcription of that Book underſtand; and it ſignifies the moſt univerſal and full way of praiſing God, eſpecially by ſinging; and it's expreſt by various words, as (αἰνεῖν, ἐπαινεῖν) *to praiſe*; (ἐγκωμιάζειν) *to commend or ſet forth the reputation of another*; (δοξάζειν) *to glorifie or diſcover the glory of another*; (ὑμνεῖν)

(εὐλογεῖν) *to bless*, with many other expressions; So in particular (ψάλλειν) *Psal.* 145. 1. but most especially is this last word (תְּהִלָּה) which is a word for all Psalms expresst by (ὕμνος) *a Hymn*; as 2 *Chron.* 7. 6. and 23. 13. *Psal.* 39. 4. 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. *Psal.* 21. 13. *Psal.* 64. 1. and 99. 3. where the one word is translated by the other.

For their conjunction of each of them together in one a title of a Psalm, is very usual, and often inverted: The title of *Psal.* 29. 1. is in the Hebrew, מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר, *Mizmor Schir*; in the Greek Translation its ψάλμος ᾠδῆς, *A Psalm of a Song, or a Song and a Psalm.* So 64. 1. and 47. 1. and 86. 1. but in 65. 1. there the title is שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר, and translated ᾠδὴ ψάλμου, *A Song of a Psalm, or a Song and Psalm.* So *Psal.* 82. 1. But unto the title of *Psal.* 75. the 70 Greek Interpreters (from whom these words are borrowed in the New Testament) do add all the three together; Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ἐν ὕμνοις, ψάλμος τῷ Ἀσάφ, ᾠδὴ πρὸς τὴν Ἀσσύριον; *A Psalm to* Asaph *in or with Hymns; a Song to the Assyrians.* By all which we see, and might by many more,

1. That there is not such a critical distinction to be made between a spiritual Psalm, and a Hymn, and Song, but that they are put indifferently one for another.

2. Having opened the words with their use (I hope with advantage to those that know the language of the Hebrew with the Septuagint) let us now consider them as the matter to be sung, and what these

Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs are; whether *Davids*, *Aſaphs*, *Hemans*, and ſuch other which are found in Scripture pen'd by holy men upon ſpecial occaſions, or another of a new compoſure; the former of which I affirm to be an Ordinance of the New Teſtament.

1. Theſe are the titles given ſolely to *Davids Pſalms*, and the other Scripture-Songs, which theſe holy men, Divinely inſpired, breathed forth, and left on record: And as Mr. *Cotton* excellently argues, What reaſon can there be why the Apoſtle ſhould direct us in our ſinging to the very title of *Davids Pſalms*, and other Scripture-Songs, if he meant we ſhould not ſing theſe Pſalms and Songs? Either we muſt exclude *Davids Pſalms* and the reſt from being called Pſalms, or Hymns, or Spiritual Songs, or elſe they muſt be ſung as well as others.

2. The names are borrowed from the Greek Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, and there is no diſtinction of them in the New; neither can any one tell what they mean, but as by their uſe in the Old Teſtament: Now theſe names were uſed there as peculiar characters to expreſs and diſtinguiſh the works of *David*, and the reſt, which were penned to be ſung in the Church: Let theſe which are againſt ſinging *Davids Pſalms*, and of other holy men, ſhew us any one word or ſyllable in the New Teſtament, where any of theſe words are taken in any other ſenſe then as they were in the Old, and yet we are commanded to ſing them in the New; on this ground the caſe would

be

be soon concluded; when the question is propounded, (granting this is a command for singing) what shall we sing? why, Psalms, Hymns, and spiritual Songs; how shall we know what these are? we must look in Scripture, where these words are used; now we find them nowhere explained so properly as in the Old Testament; where they are the usual titles of *Davids* Psalms, and the songs of other Holy men, and no other use of them expresst in the New; why may not we judge then, these are the Psalms, and Hymns, and spiritual Songs we are there commanded for to sing? But,

3. Come to the New Testament, and there when ever Christ or his Apostles speak of Psalms, they refer us to Scripture Psalms, *Luke* 20. 42. (Christ saith) As it is written in the Book of the Psalms, that is the 110. *Psalm, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand*: in *Luke* 24. 44. when Christ would make an exact division of the Old Testament, he divides them into the Law of *Moses*, the Prophets, and the Psalms, distinguishing the *Psalms* from all other Scripture, as a peculiar book by it self; And as when we are commanded to read the Law, and the Prophets, we cannot think them to be any other then the writings of *Moses* and *Samuel*, and the rest of the Prophets in the Old Testament; So when we are commanded to sing Psalms, not the Law or the Prophets: how can we imagine it unlawful to sing that part of Scripture which is properly called the *Psalms*, as the writings of *David*, *Asaph*, &c? So the Apo-

Acts 1.20. ſpeaking of *Judas* his fall, and ruin, ſaith, as it was written of him in the Book of the *Pſalms*, *Let his habitation be made deſolate*, &c. *Pſ.* 69. 26. and in the 16 *verſe* (ſaith *Peter*) the Holy Ghoſt by the *mouth of David* ſpake this concerning *Judas*, & *v.* 20. for it is written in the Book of the *Pſalms*. *Acts* 2. *Acts* 25. and 29. in ſtead of ſaying as in the *Pſalms*, he ſaith, *David* ſpeaketh of Chriſt thus and thus in *Pſal.* 16. *Acts* 13. 33. ſpeaking of Chriſt again; he ſaith, *As it is written in the ſecond Pſalm*, and *v.* 35. *As it is written in another Pſalm*, which is the 16. By all which is clear what Chriſt and the Apoſtles would have us underſtand by *Pſalms* (when we are commanded to ſing them) eſpecially theſe *Pſalms*, which are called the Book of the *Pſalms*; and there is no other *Pſalms* ſpoken of in the New Teſtament; and the Holy-Ghoſt is the beſt Expoſitor of his own commands. Now men muſt either deny theſe of *Davids*, (as before) to be *Pſalms*, or elſe they are bound to ſing them as for Hymns and Songs; they are comprehended under this general word (*Pſalms*) being all expreſt in the Book of the *Pſalms*, as hath been demonſtrated.

4. Let us conſider the vainity of the contrary opinion, in regard it utterly makes way for will-worſhip, which they ſeem to be ſo much againſt. For firſt, I am commanded to ſing Pſalms, Hymns, Songs: the Old and New Teſtament ſpeak of no other Pſalms then of *Davids* and *Aſaphs*, & of ſuchlike inſpired perſons; and they are called the Pſalms by Chriſt and his Apo-

Apoſtles, but you muſt not ſing them (ſay they.) I ask what Pſalms then muſt you ſing? there is no light in Old or New Teſtament to warrant any other; either you muſt fancy a Pſalm, and ſay Chriſt meant this way, when he ſpake of the Book of the Pſalms, and deviſe a new way of worſhip out of your own brains, or elſe ſing theſe Pſalms, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles call Pſalms. Beſides, 2. How can any man perſwade himſelf, or others, when he ſings, that he ſings a Pſalm, when he doth not ſing that which in Scripture is onely called a Pſalm? Or how can any man diſtinguiſh, now I ſing a Pſalm, now a Hymn, now a Song, when there is not one word in the New Teſtament to diſtinguiſh them one from another, or the two latter from the Book of the Pſalms? if any man from the New Teſtament can diſtinguiſh a Pſalm from a Hymn, or a Hymn from an Ode or Song, or any one from another, but as they borrowit from the Old Teſtement, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*; he ſhall be an Oracle I will conſult more then with Scripture. They tell us *Davids* Pſalms, and the like are not to be ſung; Chriſt and his Apoſtles call them ſpecially by the name of Pſalms, and command us to ſing Pſalms. Now let them ſhew us any other Pſalms from Scripture, and we are ſatisfied; but it's hard to be perſwaded from ſuch a pretious Ordinance, by a meer Negative, and the workings of a melancholy fancy, or the preſumption of a hot brain that he hath a gift of compoſing Pſalms, and Songs, and Hymns, for the edification of the Church.

Let

Let us go on further, and try the Scripture examples; and begin with our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Disciples, after the administration of his Supper; its said in *Math.* 26.30. and *Mark* 14.26. *when they had sung an Hymn,* (or a *Psalm*) (as the margent expresseth it,) and its all one, *they went forth to the mount Olivet*; the words are, καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος &c. Take it either as all Translators interpret, having sung an *Hymn*, Hymn *dicto Arab*: *They went forth*, or *they went forth hymning*, (or singing of a *Psalm*,) its not material: But 1. Its clear they sung openly with their voice. 2. They sung a *Psalm* or *Hymn*; now what this *Hymn* should be, is the question, whether one of *Davids Psalms*, or any in that Book; to which I answer: 1. Its onely said they sung an *Hymn* or *Psalm*, and its most probable, yea demonstrative, that it was one of these *Psalms*, or *Hymns* of *David* and the other Holy men, because Christ himself speaks of no other, as before: 2. Because Christ was so much prophesied of in these *Psalms*, which were formerly sung prophetically, and with thanksgiving for these very acts before-hand. 3. Because Christ did still quote the same *Psalms*, to prove both his Divinity and sufferings; so did his Apostles. Now it was no more dishonour, or unsuitable to Christ to sing with his Disciples one or more of these *Hymns* or *Psalms*, then it was to prove himself, and his mediatorship by them, which he doth in all the former places, yea the very nature and manner of his sufferings. 4. We have

Scripture

Scripture ground from Christs expression to believe the one, and only our own conjectures that he sung any other *Psalms*, or *Hymns*; and that Christ both before and after his death should bring his choice proofs of his person, and humiliation, and glory from the book of the *Psalms*, and when he was to suffer it should be found they sung a *Psalm*, or *Hymn*, and yet not one of these *Psalms*, is very hard to press on a Scripture conscience, especially when the act exprest is in general, and the same word used for singing such *Psalms*, and no other determination of it in the New Testament: let men but weigh things in an equal ballance of the Sanctuary and Judge; yea, let them who are so high on the other side, shew us from Scripture what that *Hymn*, or *Psalm* was, which Christ and his Disciples sung after the Supper, and give us any place as a comment on it, and but the hint to our demonstration, and we shall think our selves well quit of such a mistake: in the mean while the argument stands thus untouched, Christ and his Disciples sung an *Hymn*, and Christ and the Apostles speak of no other *Hymns*, or *Psalms*, but these recorded in the Old Testament, especially these in the book of the *Psalms*; therefore they sung none other. And surely Christ would conform his practise to his expressions, or would have made some distinction.

The second great example of singing is that of *Paul* and *Silas*, *Acts* 16. 25. where it is said, *They sung an Hymn to God, or gave praises in the prison at midnight*; we are still on the same account as formerly, and ask

what

what this *Hymn* was they ſung, if not one of theſe *Pſalms* of Scripture which they might have choſen for this preſent condition? If any one can ſay it was an exemporary ejaculation, let them ſhew us their proof; we ſhew them the Scripture-uſe of the word, and which was known to them; and theſe that oppoſe muſt have ſomething from the reaſon of the Text, or uſe of the Word to contradict us, and confirm themſelves; they did not barely ſing, but ὕμνον τὸν θεὸν, they ſung *Hymns*; and do not we go on ſurer grounds that ſing theſe *Pſalms* and *Hymns*, which in the New Teſtament Chriſt and his Apoſtles do call ſo, then what we imagine to be *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, &c. by an unſcriptural ſuppoſition? ſo that the ſumm of all may be drawn up thus to argue.

1. It is our duty to obey Divine commands; It is a command to ſing *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*; *ergo*, it is our duty.

2. It is a command to ſing *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*, as to the matter; but there is no other *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, or *ſpiritual Songs* mentioned in the Old or New Teſtament, but theſe which are pen'd by Holy men, inſpired to that end; *ergo*, it is our duty to ſing them.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

An Answer to that Objection concerning singing by a gift, not set Psalms.

One special Objection that is made against singing Scripture *Psalms*, &c. is that it hinders the exercise of gifts, and so its but formal; all duties in the Church must be done from a gift.

Answer. 1. You see here is a duty laid on us, no such limitation as from a gift.

2. The matter is prescribed you, *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, and to these you are especially enjoyned: now the limitation of the matter limits the duty.

3. There is no promise of such a gift in the Gospel, to compose *Psalms*, and *Hymns*; God hath provided matter sufficient; there is a promise for the spirit of prayer and supplication, *Zach.* 12. and of preaching and propheſying, in *Joel*, repeated in *Acts* 2. but no distinct promise for a gift of spiritual Poetry, or Singing; for there are but three things required to singing, fit matter, a voice, and heart; all which may be performed without any such special gift of composing; the matter is ready, if the heart and voice be present.

4. It is a duty laid generally on the whole Church, without any distinction of gifts; all are commanded to sing, &c. Here is no hint of a gift required.

5. Christ

5. Christ would not ordain an Ordinance of such consequence, which the Churches should want the use of; some utterly, and not one among many should know what it means; for there is hardly one among a thousand of Saints which hath such a gift of composing *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, &c. and if it be an Ordinance in one Church, all others may want it, and so be deprived of the comfort of such a sweet Ordinance for want of a pretended gift, when they have matter enough of praises before them.

6. It is lawful to make use of the gifts of others, as well as to use our own; when a man hath a gift of prayer, I joyn with him, and make use of his gifts, &c. So is it much more lawful to make use of the gifts of holy and blessed men in Scripture, who had that glorious gift of composing all sorts of *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *spiritual Songs*, and when we sing them with melody in our hearts, we manifest all those treasures of the gifts of the spirit, that breathed in these *Psalms*, &c. as if we had from a personal gift composed them our selves; for if we sing them with the same understanding, with the same inward affection of love, joy, &c. we sing them with the same spirit.

7. If there were such a gift promised, it would have been mentioned by Christ or his Apostles, as the gift of tongues and miracles were, and Saints would have been instructed to seek for it, and those that had it, would have been commanded to wait on it, as the Elders are on exhortation, teaching, ruling, the

Deacons

Deacons on administring, and distributing, &c. *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

8. It is Antichristian to introduce an Ordinance to be practised among the Churches, which hath not been commanded by Christ and his Apostles, (these that differ, make much use of the word *Antichristian*) and cannot but grant this principle to be undeniable; now I assume but to introduce; A way of singing by a gift, with casting off Scripture-*Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, was never commanded by Christ or his Apostles, *ergo*, it is Antichristian; the minor hath been proved before; there is no mention in the writings of Christ or the Apostles, of singing *Psalms* by a personal gift, or of a gift of composing *Psalms* either for our selves or the Church; neither is there mention of any other *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the matter to be sung, but such as are pen'd in Scripture, and left to be sung by all the Churches. Thus if men will bring in a new Ordinance, they must shew their authority from the Word, or else apply the word *Antichristian* to themselves.

For that expression in 1 *Corinth.* 14. 26. *When you come together* (ἕκας☞ ὑμῶν ψαλμὸν ἔχει) *every one hath a Psalm, hath a Doctrine*, &c. from whence they gather they had a gift of composing *Psalms* by the Spirit, which they were to sing in the Church if they did it orderly.

To which I further answer, there is not any thing to explain what *Psalm* this was.

2. We have more reason to think it was one of these Scripture

Scripture *Psalms*, which the New Testament always calls a *Psalm* (as he saith, in the second *Psal.* and in another *Psalm* as before) far more reason then they have to say it was a *Psalm* of their own composing by a gift; every one hath a *Psalm*, that is, this and the other have a *Psalm*, that is, one had this, *Psalm* in Scripture which he thought most proper, another, another of these *Psalms*; for ἕκας & is not to be taken universally of all, but singularly; one hath this, another that; thus some; but rather the meaning is, not as if one had this *Psalm*, and another another; but one hath a *Psalm*, another a *Doctrine*, another to speak with tongues, another to prophesie; now thus there was a confusion among them; one would have a *Psalm* sung, another would have his *Doctrine*, or *word of Construction* as most fit, another his *Revelation*. Now the Apostle onely tells them they might all be done one by one, and in order; he that had a *Psalm* to be sung, might in its proper place, but this doth not prove that it was a *Psalm* extemporarily composed, or by a personal gift, or that it was not one of the *Psalms* in that which the Scripture calls the Book of the *Psalms*.

Object. If any say further, It must needs be from a gift, because it is joyned with other acts which were meerly from a gift, as *Doctrine*, *Tongues*, *Revelations*, *Prophecy*, *Interpretation*.

I Answer, Of these things here named, some are accounted extraordinary, and peculiar, as gifts of *Tongues*, *Revelations*, fitted for these times; the other ordina-

ordinary, as *Doctrine*, *Interpretation*, *Propheſie* (though ſome think this laſt extraordinary alſo) ſo having a *Pſalm*, may be accounted ordinary, and not from an extraordinary gift, as the gift of tongues was; however you muſt not make a particular argument from things of divers conſiderations and uſes.

2. Other Scriptures have determined what a *Pſalm* is, and it may be eaſily gathered what it is in the *Corinthians* for one to have a *Pſalm*: we prove they had a *Pſalm*; let them prove what that *Pſalm* was, beſides theſe Scripture-*Pſalms* onely mentioned in the New Teſtament.

It is moſt evident that the matter of ſinging is determined by the words of the Apoſtle, in *Coloſ.* 3. 16. *Let the word of God dwell richly in you*, &c. which in *Eph.* 5. is more in general, *Be filled with the Spirit*, which do not make any difference; for the Word and the Spirit muſt make up the melody in our hearts: but ſtill the word of God is the matter to be ſung with the Spirit, as it is the matter for reading, preaching, interpretation; but he here names that part of the Word which belongs to the duty he enjoyns; as a ſpecial part of that Word which ought to dwell richly in them, as to ſuch a duty of ſinging: So that,

1. If *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, be part of the word of God, then they may be ſung.

2. If that part of the Word be more properly fitted to the duty commanded then any other, it muſt be ſo reſtrained here.

3. That it is so, appears, because he speaks so particularly, *That the Word might dwell in them richly, teaching and admonishing one another*; not in *general*, as by Preaching, Doctrine, or the like: but in *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *spiritual Songs*, which must needs be the great duty in the Text, and all before restricted to that.

4. Then the word of God in general, or any special Word of God may be said to dwell richly in a person, when the spiritual intent, sense, and meaning of it, with the inward spirit, and power of it upon all occasions doth appear in the duties commanded by it; and thus you may see the verse in its parts.

1. Here is the duty, singing.

2. The Word of God, the matter

3. The specialty of the Word so fitted to the nature of that duty, *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *spiritual Songs*.

4. The peculiar way how to be a perfect spiritual Singer; it is to have this word *dwell* in a man, and richly, having the true sense, sweet experience of this word in the heart, being upon all occasions able to cull out in the language of Scripture, *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, suitable to our own conditions or others.

If the Apostle had meant here a gift of composing new *Psalms*, &c. as he would not have used the Old Testament language without an explanation; so he would not have mentioned the word of God in such a close limitation as in *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*.

Songs, which are exegetical to the word of God to be ſung, if he had not intended that part of the Word as fitted for that Ordinance; for no man knows what theſe expreſſions hold forth, but as they are found in the word of God, and as a diſtinct and eminent part of it. It were more proper to ſay, *Let the grace of God dwell in you*, or *the goodneſs of God*, that you may from the ſenſe of it break forth upon all occaſions to praiſes. But to name the Word of God, and name it with that modification, as Pſalms, Hymns, Songs, which we all know is a part of it, and bid us ſing, and deny us in his intention for to ſing theſe Pſalms which are part of that Word, is too unworthy a reflection on the Holy Ghoſt, and the Pen-men of Scripture. And that ſeems very ſtrange to affirm, that I may not ſing that Word of God which is called by the name of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, when this Word muſt dwell in me richly to that end and uſe.

Laſtly, the ſinging of theſe *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the Word of God, is moſt adapt and proportioned to the particular uſe the Apoſtle intended, by ſinging in the Church, which was to teach and admoniſh one another. Now no gift of any Saint can be ſo powerful, and authoritative to teach, as the Word of God in theſe *Pſalms*, which were pen'd by the ſpirit, as a rule to all Saints, and their gifts; and as the Word of God is made uſe of ſeveral ways to teach, and admoniſh, ſo this is one ſpecial way, by *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, *Songs*. When I ſing by a pretended

gift, I see cause of jealousie, that it may be more a fancy then the spirit; every man hath cause of suspition from whence it comes, and ere I can be satisfied, I must compare it with, and try it by the Scripture strain of *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*. But by singing the very words of Scripture with sense, and experience, I teach both by my holy carriage in the action, and the word it self commands by its own authority, as when it is read.

But that I may more clearly open this, how that the Word of God in *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, is the most fit matter of singing, let us view that part of the Word called by these names, and see how far it will reach this kind of edification, beyond all that which may come from a present gift to compose matter for such a duty.

1. Besides the spiritual elegancy of phrase, the inspired style of that part of holy writ, which is beyond ordinary with the height of matter, of no vulgar composure, it having such a standing stamp of Divine authority on it, must needs conveigh its sense with more weight and power, then any thing from particular invention, though assisted by a gift of the spirit, which comes but in the second place, and cannot be put in any consideration with that authority as the other, nor inserted among the heavenly Canons and Scripture rules for Saints to build their faith on, or direct their lives.

2. The largeness, and comprehensiveness of the scope of the shortest Psalm, is so, that it will give matter

matter to ſtudy and ponder on, and give advantage to enlarge our thoughts and affections on more then any particular gift of any Saint now can be rationally conceived to afford; for commonly the beſt gifts are but an enlargement of the firſt text, and bring forth nothing *de novo*, no new thing, and all theſe Saints with all their gifts muſt be glad to have recourſe to that part of the Word, as the reſt, for the fulneſs of teaching and admonition.

3. The variety of matter in theſe *Pſalms*, &c. is ſo wonderful, that they do provide before-hand by an eternal wiſdom, for the conditions of all Saints, either perſonally, or myſtically, that no man ſing any thing, but if that Word dwell in him richly, he may finde a ſuitable *Pſalm* prepared for him, by the foreſight, and wiſe, and infallible directions of the Almighty; and in this, the Book of the *Pſalms* tranſcends all other parts of Scripture, and may be called the Epitome of the whole Bible. In ſome Scriptures you have little but matter of precept, in others little but hiſtorical relations of perſons, and actions; but in the Book of the *Pſalms* you have the variety of matter conteined in all the whole Scripture, moſt ſuitable to the vaſt duty of ſinging praiſes.

1. Matter of all ſorts of propheſies referring to the very latter end of the world.

2. All ſorts of general and ſpecial directions, either for Faith or Life.

3. All ſorts of promiſes fitted to particular conditions.

4. All ſorts of experiences in what condition a ſoul may be in, either of tryal or triumph, either to ſoul or body.

5. All ſorts of ſigns, and characters of heavenly motions and frames to God.

6. All ſort of thankſgivings and prayſes for ſpiritual or temporal mercies, with their various diſcords, which makes up the harmony of the whole. He is a childe in the Scripture, that doth not admire the unparallel'd variety of truth in that Book, ſo that if I were raiſed by ſome extraordinary gift to the greateſt enlargement of compoſing a *Pſalm*, or *ſpiritual Song* on a ſpecial occaſion, I ſhould come ſhort of the variety, and fulneſs of the leaſt of theſe *Pſalms*, and yet the ignorant ſtanders by might more admire my gift, and there would be more danger in it, then to ſing the Scripture-*Pſalms* which have nothing from men to grace them but their own native majeſty and authority. And truly, it is ſomewhat odd for one to be ſet up by others, or for any one to be ſet up himſelf as a ſpiritual Poet in the Church, and the Church to ſing his thoughts, with the neglect of the Word of God, which is furniſhed with ſuch variety for the conditions of ſouls.

And as the Word of God in general is ſo large, and vaſt, and various, that all the Saints with their higheſt emprovements can never come up to the fulneſs of it, and all the vaſt folio's that have been written by commentators of all ſorts, have hardly pierced the bark, the ſhell, the letter, and all Saints of the higheſt

highest attainment, must dig in to it as the onely visible Mine, and we must not exclude the *Psalms* as to singing from that fulness and variety, seeing Christ himself when he distinguisheth the whole Scripture, gives the *Psalms* an equal part.

Chap. IV.

Concerning the Translation of Davids Psalms, *and other* spiritual Hymns, *and* Songs, *with the Answer to the Objection arising from it.*

I Have endeavoured to prove the duty; let us consider the strength of the main Objections against it.

Ob. The first in order is that which carps at the Translation, and that into Meetre, as the humane invention; the Translation (say they) is corrupt, and especially as into Meetre, and Tune; if you will sing *Davids Psalms*, sing them in Hebrew, as they were sung formerly: this they much stick on.

Sol. To which I answer, That in these Psalms, and Songs, there was a set Meetre, fitted to Tunes, and Voices, and musical Instruments; none can deny that observes the Dedications of most Psalms, and those of understanding that can read *learned Gomarus* may see it fully, and with great exactness; where the spiritual poesie of these Psalms is excellently set forth.

2. So far as there is corruption in the Tranſlation, it is ſpurious, and not to be approved of, but corrected.

3. But Tranſlations according to the import of the words and ſenſe of the text, are as much the Word of God, as the Text in the original; for the coherence of word and ſenſe make up the copy entire and perfect.

4. Which follows, the Tranſlation of the words in Meetre, if it have the full ſenſe of the words, is as much the Word of God, as if it were tranſlated in proſe, or ordinary ſentence for reading; for it is not the way or method, but the ſenſe and meaning of the words, that is the *Word* of God. So that I may as well ſay when I ſing in ſuch a compoſition, it is as much the *Word of God* as when I read the ſame words in the Bible, onely they are orderly diſpoſed for that action. None muſt by this reaſon, pretend to know the Word of God in reading or expounding, but he that knows the Hebrew, and Greek; and that muſt be alſo in the firſt perfect copy, immediately tranſcribed from inſpired underſtandings; for all things beſides are either tranſlations, or additions, or ſubſtractions, from which two laſt comes perfect corruption.

So that a tranſlation for ſinging, or reading is the *ſame Word of God* as long as it hath the ſame ſubſtantial truth in it; and ſing them which way you will, either as they lie in the verſe, or as the ſame verſe is digeſted into ſtaves, and with muſical notes, it is all one as to the nature of ſinging, and the tranſlation

may

may be as Orthodox in Meetre, as in Proſe; ſo that you ſee what force, efficacy, that objection from the tranſlation carries with it; I confeſs there are many defects in the tranſlation into Meetre, but there are the like in ſome copies in proſe, or continued ſentence; but as to the nature of the thing, one verſe may as well be made two, according to muſical notation, and yet retain the ſame continued ſenſe, as remain one, only bounded by Arithmetical figures, as 1,2,3. &c.

Ob. But if any one ſay the Pſalms, as thus tranſlated into Meetre, are but an humane invention, and you worſhip God onely after a humane form.

Sol. The Anſwer is at hand.

1. To know the ſignificancies of the tongues, and how to tranſlate them to edification, is a ſpecial gift of Gods ſpirit, 1 *Cor.* 12.28,29. 1 *Corinth.* 14.1,2, 3,4,5,6.

2. On this ground we read humane inventions when we read the Old or New Teſtament in any tranſlation, but the firſt copies of Hebrew and Greek, wherein they were firſt written.

3. Is it not more a humane invention for to ſing any thing of my own compoſing, then for to ſing the very matter, and ſenſe of the Word of God in my own tongue? and yet its uſual among theſe that are againſt this Ordinance, to cry aloud, It is a humane invention, Antichriſtian.

4. The tranſlation of the Scripture for to be read, is as much a humane invention, as in poeſie to be ſung; but this is an Objection urged for want of a better.

Ob.

Ob. The next grand Objection is, that we may as well uſe a ſet form of Prayer, as of ſinging Pſalms; the one is as lawful as the other, the one ſtints the ſpirit as much as the other.

Sol. 1. There is no Divine holds that a ſet form of Prayer is abſolutely unlawful, for then no man may meditate before hand what he ought to pray for, nor conſult with his own mouth, or Gods promiſes; for if I meditate on what I need, and what God hath promiſed, I form ſuch petitions, and tye my ſelf to them as neceſſary to be petitioned for, and it may be I may have no occaſion for a long while to begg any thing of God, but the ſubſtance of theſe premeditated conſiderations of my want.

2. Here lies the unlawfulneſs of ſet form of Prayer, that it is compoſed by one, and impoſed by another, to which I am limited, let my wants be what they will, requiring further additions when I neither ſtudy my own wants, nor am permitted to urge them to God in my prayer.

3. This is a more ſuitable Objection againſt thoſe that pretend to ſing by a gift, and do make Pſalms, or Hymns, or Songs, for themſelves and others, with neglect of inſpired Pſalms, and Hymns. So ſinging of Pſalms, and uſing a ſet form of Prayer, are very nigh of kin, and hold much correſpondency.

4. But to ſing the very words of theſe Scriptures with underſtanding, is a command, as hath been formerly proved; and if you take a ſet form of praying, for praying Scripture-words, and ſpeaking to God

God in that language, it is not only lawful, but is the excellency of ſome Saints, who ſeldom make a Petition, but they urge it in Scripture-dialect, and ſhew the Word of God to dwell richly in them; thus for ſinging to praiſe God, or ſing to God in his own form of words in the ſpirit, and underſtanding, what can be more ſutable to God, and ſweet to the ſoul?

5. There is a great deal of difference between praying and ſinging, as to the method of performance, though praying and praiſes may be conſidered in the ſame duty, *yet praying and ſinging* require a diſtinct method; for the very words, to ſing Pſalms, and Hymns, and Songs, import a ſpecial method of the voice in a ſet tune, and proportion, whereas prayer in the method of performance requires no ſuch exactneſs; if one ſhould take on him to ſing, and not in a ſet form, and tune, he would be ridiculous to all hearers: but a man hath a larger liberty in prayer, and is not tyed to ſuch ſtrait connexions, heighths, and falls, ſtops, and pauſes; but the nature of this Ordinance calls for it, elſe it cannot be done gracefully, though there be grace in the heart. And if the Apoſtle had not meant by ſinging of Pſalms, ſinging *muſically*, he would have onely bid them praiſe in the general, and have left out the outward expreſſion of it, which cannot be acted but in a ſet form.

6. If ſinging were not in a muſical manner, (as before) it were the ſame with prayer, for you may ſing out a prayer, and praiſe in praying. Thus in *David's* Pſalms,

Pſalms. How many Pſalms which were matter only of petition, yet were ſung with faith and confidence in God? For performance, the Apoſtle *James* diſtinguiſheth them apparently, *Is any ſick? let him pray; is any merry? let him ſing Pſalms*; and the other Apoſtle, *Let us pray with the Spirit, and underſtanding, and ſing with the Spirit*, &c. Now wherein lies the difference? In prayer you have variety of workings, and conſiderations; there is *Deprecation*, *Imprecation*, *Acclamation*, and *Admiring*, *Pleading*, and *urging promiſe*, and the like. So in ſinging, there are the like; the difference is onely in the ſet, and muſical way of expreſſion, which requires a more ſet form before-hand to rule my outward carriage by, in that Ordinance; whereas in prayer we are not tyed to ſuch a ſeverity of method, and ſo need not have our words ſo formed.

Another plea, which is ſomewhat ſcurrilous, by the ruder ſort, yet much urged, is, that we *lye* when we ſing Pſalms, and affirm that we cannot but *lye* when we ſing the phraſes of many Pſalms. As that of *David*, *O Lord I am not puffed in minde*, *I am as a weaned child*, &c.

To which I reply, in general, that ſome may not have the frame of theſe expreſſions, when they ſing, and ſo may perform a duty which may be but as a lye to them. but;

1. In ſpecial, there is no Saint but can in ſome meaſure ſay what ever *David* ſaith in that or any other Pſalm, deſcribing the ſpiritual qualification of his

his heart; all graces are in every Saint there in the ſeed, and habit, and in a proportion, though all are not ſo eminent and apparent in the bud and fruit; though no godly man is free from pride, yet he cannot be a godly man that is a proud man *in actu ſignato*, which hath never been humbled, and brought out of himſelf; thus all along the 119. *Pſalm*, that Anatomy of a Saints inward parts, when *David* ſaith, *He delights in the Law of God, He hopes in Gods mercy, His ſoul longs after God, He keeps his Commandments, He hates every evil way*, &c. every godly man may ſing theſe and all other Pſalms, and ſpeak truth; for the reality of theſe frames are the ſame in every gracious heart.

2. Whatever I finde to be the caſe of any Saint, I may make it mine according to the likeneſs of my condition to it, and yet not a lye.

3. One great uſe of ſinging is to commend the excellency of ſuch graces which are and have been in others to ſweeten the harſhneſs of other duties, and to ſtir and quicken the heart to the endeavouring after ſuch like frames: therefore ſome Law-givers have put their Laws into verſe firſt, that the people might take a pleaſure in them, and ſing them as their recreations, and be the more inſinuated into obedience.

4. I can tell no lye ſo long as in the ſincerity of my ſoul I ſtudy my duty, and ſing with deſire after ſuch qualifications, from the contemplation of the beauty of them in ſuch holy men, though I do not find the

pre-

preſent frame ſo high as I breath after, and ſuch men found at preſent.

Ob. But this Objection, grant it in its full Latitude, proves nothing againſt the nature of the Ordinance of ſinging, but the perſons who ſing, who are not fitly qualified to ſome expreſſions.

Again, others plead, Pſalms that are ſung are not ſutable to my condition.

Sol. 1. That is nothing ſtill againſt the Ordinance of ſinging; if it do not fit you, it fits others. But,

2. There is nothing in Scripture-expreſſions but all Saints at all times may make ſome uſe of in the very reading or ſinging; if not ſo particularly, yet as to the general nature of inſtruction, and edification, it is profitable; Saints muſt read all Scripture, with faith and underſtanding; though every place may not ſo directly open their preſent condition; and why may not they ſing as well all Pſalms?

3 It ſhould be the care of Officers in the Church, to be very choice in picking out Pſalms fit for the Church, according to the nature of the body, and times, and ſeaſons; and I could wiſh there were more choiceneſs obſerved in that particular; yet the Ordinance remains ſtill the ſame.

4. When I ſing any of theſe Pſalms, I ſhould by Faith perſonate the ſame ſtate of the Church, or the Saints, as when I apply promiſes made to others, I do their conditions, as if it were ſpoken to me.

5. It is for want of Divine ſtudy of the nature of theſe

theſe Scripture expreſſions, and the myſtery of them that we ſay ſuch a Pſalm is unſuitable to our conditions; for if when I read underſtandingly, I can get profit by them, I can the ſame when I ſing them.

6. If it do not reach my condition, as to a particular caſe I am troubled withall, or the providence I am eminently under; yet it concerns the ſtate of the Church, and I may ſing them as a Member of the ſame Body, and ſympathiſing with them either in ſorrow or joy, in afflictions or triumphs; which is a ſpecial way ro act the graces of Saints, ſometimes to ſing what concerns others as themſelves, as to pray for others as themſelves; this is like Chriſts heart in heaven.

Laſtly, you have opportunity enough to chuſe Pſalms for your emergencies. It is good to keep the harmony of the whole Body in the main.

Ob. That which follows next as urged againſt this truth, is, that its confuſion to ſing together, and that but one ſhould ſing at one time.

Sol. Still this is not againſt the Ordinance of ſinging. But,

1. Singing is more melodious and ſuitable, when performed by many, then one ſeveral inſtrument at one time; and ſo ſeveral voices make the greater Harmony: the excellency of ſinging lies in the Church, which is made up of divers voices.

2. Chriſt and his Diſciples ſung together, *Mat.* 26. 30. ὑμνήσαντες, they ſung, *Paul* and *Silas* Act. 16 25. *ſung together in the Priſon*, not one after another, but together.

Ob.

Ob. But if any one say, when one prayes, all may be said to pray, though he doth but consent; it way be so in singing of Psalms.

It is Answered, 1. All Ordinances must be considered according to their proper nature; some Ordinances are so to be administred, as that onely one at once can perform it, as publike prayer, and preaching, and yet there must be a distinction even in these: my silence in prayer ought to be when I pray with another, and yet I may be said to pray as well as he which is the mouth of the whole, because my heart is with him in the same petitions, and my desires go equally with him; but it is not so in preaching, where silence must be likewise from the nature of the Ordinance; yet though I consent fully with the matter, and agree in all that is said with never so much affection, yet I cannot be said to preach, but onely he that speaketh preacheth. So now as to singing there is a difference likewise of another consideration; if onely one sing, none else can be said to sing, though they joyn with the matter, and agree to it in their hearts; for its an outward act, and terminated in the person that performs it; and though in my silent conjunction, I may really praise God, yet I can in no sense be properly said to sing with others, without I do use my Voice and Organs as they do. This consideration will give light to men that minde the nature and distinction of Ordinances in their outward administrations.

2. That which is the confusion of other Ordinances, is the beauty of this; for two to preach, or pray together

gether at the ſame time and place, were the greateſt confuſion imaginable; but for a hundred to ſing together is moſt harmonious, and pleaſant; ſo far from the breach of order, that harmony is moſt diſcovered by it.

3. It hath been the cuſtome of the Churches always thus to practiſe; and there is nothing in the nature of the Ordinance, or Divine precept, or example againſt it. I ſhall conclude this with a word from Antiquity, concerning this practiſe.

Euſeb. in his *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 33. quotes two Epiſtles of *Plinius Secundus* to *Trajan* the Emperor, teſtifying that Chriſtians were wont to gather themſelves before day to ſing Pſalms and Hymns together: the ſame doth *Philo Judæus* teſtifie, who lived in the Apoſtles time, as the ſame *Euſeb.* ſaith, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 22. Now in the time of *Plinius* and *Trajan*, did *John* the beloved Diſciple live, ſaith *Zanch.* in *Eph.* 5. 18. 29. whereby it appears an Apoſtolical inſtitution.

Tertul. in his *Apol. c.* 19. ſaith, that it was a uſuall cuſtome among the Chriſtians, after their Love-Feaſts, *canere de Scripturis Sanctis*, to ſing of the Scriptures; his meaning is, doubtleſs, out of, or from the Scriptures: In the Weſtern Churches this hath been the conſtant practice, though much corrupted by the *Roman* additions to Saints method; but yet that bleſſed Ordinance is now more ſpecially recovered, and made pure for Saints according to primitive inſtitution.

Chap. V.

The great abuſes of the Roman *and* Epiſcopal *Church about this Ordinance, whereby many ſtick not to call it Antichriſtian, hath been;*

1. THe introducing muſical Inſtruments together with, as Organs, Harps, Viols, &c. whereas in the New Teſtament God requires the Voice as the onely Organ of the heart in worſhip.

2. They had a meer order of Singers to whom they gave penſions unto for that purpoſe, and excluded the Church from the perſons of that duty, which is of ſo Univerſal a concernment.

3. They would ſing in Latin, and with ſuch ſtrains of their Voices, that the words might not be underſtood.

4. They ſpent moſt of the time in ſinging, and gave not other Ordinances, as preaching, and praying, their due time of exerciſe. Thus have precious Ordinances been abuſed by the corruptions of men; but are now reſtoring unto their purity, and will every day be more gloriouſly practiſed in the Churches.

Chap. VI.

How we may be ſaid to teach and admoniſh one another, in Pſalms, Hymns, *and* Songs, *according to that of* Col. 3. 16, 17.

MAny think there can be no ſuch uſe of ſinging, as to teach and admoniſh one another by it; but if we conſider, there are many leſſons to be learnt one another from this publique conjunct, ſinging Scripture-Pſalms.

1. They teach one another, and by the very act admoniſh one another to get the ſame frames theſe Holy men had in the penning the Pſalms, and in the variety, and ſpirituality of them; to get *Davids* frame, in ſinging *Davids Pſalms:* and ſo for the reſt.

2. Its by this they teach one another the Unity and Harmony that is and ſhould be among Saints as one body, that their happineſs and joys are bound up together, and ſo the miſery of one, is the miſery of the whole; and this is a glorious leſſon to know their Union together, as a body equally concerned in the glory, or ſhame of one another, equally intereſted in the praiſes of God; there is no duty practiſed in all the Goſpel that doth fully expreſs the Communion of Saints, and repreſent Heaven, as the Saints ſinging together; the Lords Supper doth repreſent the Communion of Saints very lively, but not ſo as mutuall

ſinging, when all at once, not by conſent onely, but expreſly ſpeak the ſame thing in the ſame moment; in the Lords Supper, though afterwards they were all one bread, yet they all do not receive it at the ſame inſtant of time, but take ſucceſſively the Elements; but in ſinging they all joyn perfectly at once to ſound Gods prayſes, as if they had but one Lip, and one Voice. This is the perfect Embleme of Heaven, no jarring, all with one Voice and Heart crying *Hallelujah, Hallelujah.*

3. They teach one another this leſſon alſo, *viz.* with what alacrity and cheerfulneſs they ſhould perform all their duties together; with ſweetneſs of love, and joy they ought to walk together.

4. They teach one another how to carry themſelves in all conditions with joyfull and prayſing frames of ſpirit, for matter of the Pſalms; and are various, not onely affording matter of exultation, and gratulation; but alſo reciting the ſadneſs and low condition of the Church; yet all are fit matter to be ſung; *Lachryme* muſt be ſung, ſad things with a ſpiritual joyfull heart in God and his promiſes; mercy, and judgement in the ſame ſong, expreſt in melody of the Voice, and Heart; and it ſhews a ſoul is not in a right temper when he cannot ſing over his condition

5. They teach one another by ſinging, and admoniſh one another to avoid any thing that may hinder their joys in Communion, and break their Harmony in ſpiritual actings; all which, and many more

are

are great exhortations, and are taught naturally by Saints mutual singing together.

Chap. VII.

Concerning singing with a mixt multitude.

MAny who grant singing to be an Ordinance among Saints, yet stumble to sing in promiscuous manner with others; especially because there are so many Psalms of such composition that doth not seem to concern a mixt multitude.

For opening of this, I must lay down this generall position; that prayer and praises are natural duties belonging to all men, men as men; though only the Saints can do them best, and spiritually; it is upon all men by the Law of Creation, to seek to God for what they want, and to thank him for what they have; this is due unto God, owning him as a Creator, and Benefactor; and though singing be a part of instituted worship, yet its onely an addition of Order & a regulation of a natural duty. And as there is no man but is bound to pray for mercies, so none are exempted from praising God for mercies, though they sing in a lower tune then Saints. Thus *David* calls in all creatures to bless and praise God, as a natural duty according to their several capacities, *Psal.* 136. *Psal.* 117. *Psal.* 107. *Psal.* 103. *Ps.* 20. 21. 22. Praises, its the natural duty of all, the proper duty of Saints, the perfect act of Angels. *Ob.*

Ob. You will say they cannot perform it aright, and glorifie souls.

Sol. 1. Their want of ability doth not discharge them from such a duty engraven on their Consciences, and arising from the natural respects they have to God as a Creator; to perform which, God gave full power at first.

2. Let every man do his duty conscientiously, he may afterwards come to do it spiritually; though I should lose the sense of a duty in my conscience, yet the duty lyes on my conscience from Gods authority, and my relation to him.

1. By the same rule every one should abstain from performance of a duty for want of present ability, whereas the duty must be done, and the strength expected from Heaven, and waited for according to the Divine manner of dispensation.

2. Its not unlawfull to joyn in any act with others, or to countenance them in it, which is really their duty as well as our own; I cannot sin in joyning with any one in that act to perform, which is the duty of another, as mine, though he may want the present ability.

For duties must be measured according to the rule, not the abilities of the performer; now its no duty for any man to receive the Lords Supper, or be a Member of a Church in order to Communion, without he find himself in some measure fitted by grace; these sealing Ordinances of the Gospel, suppose, and require some other qualification, and are peculiar to visible

visible Saints; but where there is a natural Character, or an Ordinance as to the substance of it at least equally concerning all; there it is no sin to joyn in the administration of it; and if we consider of it warily, unregenerate men are great sharers in the mercies of the Churches; besides their own particular, that they may well afford their voice without sin, and we joyn with them in setting forth Gods praises: But more closely, and particularly.

1. When the Church and Saints of God are gathered together to worship him, in singing; it is no more unlawfull to sing with others that stand by and joyn their voices, then when in prayer they stand by, and give their consent, we do not so much joyn with them as they do own Gods actings among us: it is no sin in them to joyn with us in such a duty, neither can it be any sin in us to sing, though others very carnal will outwardly praise God with us.

2. The carriage of Saints in their hearty and reall expressions of prayses may convince others in the coldness, and lowness of their spirit, and stir them up to some spiritual apprehensions.

3. Though it be lawful to joyn with them in such a duty generally considered, yet it were to be wished in a mixt multitude, there were more care in the choice of Psalms, to fit them to the very duty of praise and thanks, which is so really belonging to all the Congregation: and that must be lamented, that the choice of Psalms, to a mixt multitude, is not so con-

sidered

ſidered as it ought to be, which makes the Ordinance ſo much ſlighted in its publique adminiſtration. But however, the incapacity of others to their duty, ſhould not hinder me from performing mine, eſpecially when I cannot, nor ought not to hinder others from ſuch an act.

FINIS.